EN BANC

[A.M. No. 23-12-05-SC. March 04, 2025]

RE: REORGANIZING THE JUDICIAL INTEGRITY BOARD AS THE JUDICIAL INTEGRITY OFFICE

R E S O L U T I O N

KHO, JR., J.:

It is the sacrosanct duty of the Judiciary to uphold the rule of law and to preserve the rights and guarantees provided by the Constitution. In the performance of such duty, it is incumbent upon every member, official, employee, and personnel thereof to be exemplars of competence, integrity, probity, and independence in their official and personal dealings to ensure that the public's trust in the Judiciary does not waver. It bears emphasizing that "those in the Judiciary serve as sentinels of justice, and any act of impropriety on their part immeasurably affects the honor and dignity of the Judiciary and the people's confidence in it. The Institution demands the best possible individuals in the service and it had never and will never tolerate nor condone any conduct that would violate the norms of public accountability, and diminish, or even tend to diminish, the faith of the people in the justice system."[1]

Thus, and in accordance with (a) Section 6, Article VIII of the Constitution mandating that the Court shall have administrative supervision over all courts and personnel thereof; and (b) Section 11, Article VIII of the Constitution which empowers the Court *En Banc* to "discipline judges of lower courts, or order their dismissal by a vote of a majority of the Members who actually took part in the deliberations on the issues in the case and voted thereon," "the Court will not hesitate to rid its ranks of undesirables who undermine its efforts towards an effective and efficient administration of justice, thus tainting its image in the eyes of the public."[2]

Pursuant to the foregoing, the Court issued Memorandum Order No. 38-A-2016 dated September 29, 2016, establishing the Technical Working Group (TWG) on Judicial Integrity under the Committee on Continuing Legal Education and Bar Matters, the functions of which include researching measures to strengthen integrity and prevent corruption in the Judiciary, recommending the creation of offices, and proposing amendments to Rule 140 of the Rules of Court.

After an arduous process, the Court *En Banc* resolved to approve the TWG's proposals to create the Judicial Integrity Board (JIB) and the Corruption Prevention and Investigation Office (CPIO), and to amend Rule 140 of the Rules of Court to, *inter alia*,

expand its coverage to govern administrative disciplinary cases against all members (i.e., justices and judges), officials, employees, and personnel of the entire Judiciary. These matters were embodied in numerous Resolutions under A.M. No. 18-01-05-SC, as follows:

(a) Resolutions dated October 2, 2018 and July 7, 2020, creating and establishing the JIB and the CPIO and amending Rule 140 of the Rules of Court;

(b) Resolution dated December 15, 2020, approving the Internal Rules of the JIB; and

(c) Resolution dated February 16, 2021, introducing amendments to Rule 140, Section 12, of the Rules of Court and to Section 20 of the Internal Rules of the JIB.

A year later, or on February 22, 2022, the Court approved the Further Amendments to Rule 140 of the Rules of Court in A.M. No. 21-08-09-SC which is "envisioned to institutionalize a complete, streamlined, and updated administrative disciplinary framework for the entire Judiciary that is wholly independent from the Civil Service rules, harmonizes existing jurisprudence, and is uniformly applicable to all cases, regardless of when the infractions are committed." It took effect on April 3, 2022.

Shortly thereafter, on June 28, 2022 the Court approved in A.M. No. 22-04-26-SC the Strategic Plan for Judicial Innovations (SPJI) 2022-2027, a policy document seeking to establish new frameworks and adopt new approaches and, at the same time, build on and repurpose existing ones, to achieve the longtime aspiration of delivering responsive and real-time justice. One of the activities supported by the SPJI is the strengthening of the JIB to enhance its capacity and processes, particularly in encouraging and receiving complaints from the public, and acting on these complaints in a judicious, effective, and transparent manner.

In this connection, The Asia Foundation and Roadmaps and Beyond, Inc. submitted two reports related to the JIB, respectively titled "Preparing and Implementing the Digital Information System Action Plan" and "Organizational Assessment and Quasi-Diagnostic Process Mapping," which are intended to help in accomplishing the previously described activity. In response, the Court issued Memorandum Order No. 09-2023, creating the TWG that will study these reports and propose recommendations on their key results and other relevant regulations governing the JIB.

After due study, the TWG proposed to the Court *En Banc* to reorganize the JIB as the Judicial Integrity Office (JIO). This reorganization is envisioned to, among other things, fine-tune and streamline the processes relating to the handling, management, and resolution of administrative disciplinary cases filed against members, officials, employees, and personnel of the Judiciary. Significantly, and due to the enactment of Republic Act No. 11691, otherwise known as the "Judiciary Marshals Act," the TWG had also proposed that the CPIO be declared *functus officio*, considering that, *first*, under Republic Act No. 11691 and its Implementing Rules and Regulations, the

Judiciary Marshals essentially also have the powers, functions, and duties of the CPIO; and *second*, despite its creation and establishment, the CPIO, in all actuality, has never been organized.

ACCORDINGLY, the Court hereby resolves to **APPROVE** the reorganization of the Judicial Integrity Board as the Judicial Integrity Office.

This Resolution shall take effect after 15 days following its publication in two newspapers of general circulation.

SO ORDERED.

Gesmundo, C.J., Leonen, SAJ., Caguioa, Hernando, Lazaro-Javier, Inting, Zalameda, M. Lopez, Gaerlan, Rosario, J. Lopez, Dimaampao, and *Marquez, JJ.*, concur.
Singh,[*] *J.*, on leave.

---

[*] On leave.

[1] *Office of the Court Administrator v. Judge Montero*, 928 Phil. 165, 180 (2022) [Per Curiam, *En Banc*]. (Citations omitted)

[2] *Id.*

EN BANC

A.M. No. 23-12-05-SC

RE: REORGANIZING THE JUDICIAL INTEGRITY BOARD AS THE JUDICIAL INTEGRITY OFFICE

WHEREAS, Section 1, Article XI of the 1987 Philippine Constitution provides that public office is a public trust and mandates that public officers and employees must, at all times, be accountable to the people; serve them with utmost responsibility, integrity, loyalty, and efficiency; act with patriotism and justice; and lead modest lives;

WHEREAS, Section 6, Article VIII of the 1987 Philippine Constitution mandates that the Supreme Court shall have administrative supervision over all courts and personnel thereof;

WHEREAS, Section 7(3), Article VIII of the 1987 Philippine Constitution mandates that members of the Judiciary must be of proven competence, integrity, probity, and independence;

WHEREAS, the Supreme Court of the Philippines, the constitutional repository of judicial power and administrator of all courts and its personnel, has both the duty and the power to pursue its constitutional missions and ideals through the creation of an office to promote integrity and curb corruption in the Judiciary;

WHEREAS, in accordance with its constitutional authority, the Supreme Court is empowered to issue or amend the rules for the proper discharge of its administrative and disciplinary functions over all members, officials, employees, and personnel of the Judiciary;

WHEREAS, on June 28, 2022, the Court approved in A.M. No. 22-04-26-SC the Strategic Plan for Judicial Innovations (SPJI) 2022-2027, a policy document that aims to establish new frameworks and adopt new approaches, but at the same time, build on and repurpose existing ones, to achieve the longtime aspiration of delivering responsive and real-time justice;

WHEREAS, one of the activities under the SPJI is the strengthening of the Judicial Integrity Board to enhance its capacity and processes, particularly in encouraging and receiving complaints from the public, and acting on these complaints in a judicious, effective, and transparent manner;

WHEREAS, The Asia Foundation and Roadmaps and Beyond, Inc. submitted two reports related to the Judicial Integrity Board, namely: (a) "Preparing and Implementing the Digital Information System Action Plan," which is intended to provide the Judicial Integrity Board a roadmap for the "iterative transformation of its systems and processes into a digital environment;" and (b) "Organizational Assessment and Quasi-Diagnostic Process Mapping," which is intended "to help the [Judicial Integrity Board] strengthen its capacity and processes to encourage and receive complaints from the public and take action on these complaints in a judicious, effective, and transparent manner;"

WHEREAS, on January 24, 2023, the Supreme Court issued Memorandum Order No. 09-2023 creating the Technical Working Group that will study the reports, titled "*Preparing and Implementing the Digital Transformation System Action Plan*" and "*Organizational Assessment and Quasi-Diagnostic Process Mapping*" and propose recommendations on their key results;

NOW, THEREFORE, the Court resolved to **APPROVE** the reorganization of the Judicial Integrity Board as the Judicial Integrity Office, as follows:

SECTION 1. *Reorganization of the Judicial Integrity Board*. — The Judicial Integrity Board (JIB) is reorganized and shall hereafter be known as the Judicial Integrity Office (JIO). The JIO shall be under the supervision and control of the Supreme Court and will exercise administrative disciplinary functions as delegated by the Supreme Court, pursuant to this Resolution and subsequent issuances on the subject.

SECTION 2. *The Judicial Integrity Officer*. — The JIO shall be headed by the Judicial Integrity Officer who shall be appointed by the Supreme Court.

(A) *Qualifications*. — The Judicial Integrity Officer shall possess the following qualifications:

(1) must be at least 45 years of age at the time of appointment;

(2) must have been engaged in the practice of law for at least 15 years;

(3) at the time of appointment, must not be related to an incumbent justice of any of the tertiary courts, or any judge of the first and second level courts, or any official or employee of the Judiciary, within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity; and

(4) must have relevant experience in the investigation and evaluation of administrative complaints.

(B) *Tenure*. — The Judicial Integrity Officer shall serve for a term of four years and may only be reappointed once for another four-year term;

(C) *Preference for new appointment*. — Upon the retirement of an incumbent Chief Justice, the Supreme Court *En Banc*, upon the recommendation of the incoming Chief Justice, may appoint a new Judicial Integrity Officer;

(D) *Compensation and privileges*. — The Judicial Integrity Officer shall be entitled to the compensation and benefits appurtenant to Salary Grade 30, Step 8.

SECTION 3. *Jurisdiction of the JIO*. — The JIO shall have jurisdiction to do fact-finding and to recommend the corresponding penalties or clemency in accordance with recent rules and jurisprudence against the following:

(A) presiding justices and associate justices of the Court of Appeals, the Sandiganbayan, the Court of Tax Appeals, and the *Shari'ah* High Court;

(B) judges of the first and second level courts, including the *Shari'ah* District and Circuit Courts;

(C) officials and employees of all courts, including the Supreme Court; and

(D) officials and employees of all offices under the supervision of the Supreme Court, including but not limited to, the Office of the Court Administrator, Philippine Judicial Academy, Judicial and Bar Council, Mandatory Continuing Legal Education Office, and Office of the Judiciary Marshals.

The JIO shall also have jurisdiction to do fact-finding and to recommend the corresponding penalties or clemency in accordance with recent rules and jurisprudence against those enumerated above filed in the following: (a) Committee on Ethics and Special Concerns of the Court of Appeals; (b) Committee on Ethics of the Sandiganbayan; (c) Committee on Ethics of the Court of Tax Appeals on Employee's Rules of Discipline; (d) Office of the Court Administrator; or (e) the Complaints and Investigation Division of the Office of Administrative Services, Supreme Court. Whenever any of these committees or offices receive an administrative complaint against those enumerated above, they shall only determine whether the complaint is sufficient in form and substance. Thereafter, they shall immediately refer the complaint sufficient in form and substance to the JIO.

SECTION 4. *Functions of the JIO*. —

(A) The JIO shall perform the following functions:

(1) Receive administrative complaints against those enumerated under the preceding Section.

All complaints received by any court or office under the Judiciary shall be immediately referred to the JIO for evaluation and assessment.

Administrative complaints against Members of the Supreme Court, whether anonymous or not, shall be referred to the Ethics Committee of the Supreme Court, as if it was originally filed before the latter.

(2) Institute administrative complaints against those stated in the preceding Section, either *motu proprio* or upon directive of the Supreme Court, or by referral from administrative bodies, such as but not limited to, the Civil Service Commission, the Commission on Audit, the Office of the Ombudsman, or the Department of Justice.

(3) Act on the said administrative complaints in accordance with the New Code on Judicial Conduct, New Code of Conduct for Court Personnel, Internal Rules of the JIO, as well as relevant Supreme Court rules and issuances. In acting on the administrative complaints, the Judicial Integrity Officer shall evaluate the administrative complaint and prepare the report and recommendation to be submitted to the Supreme Court.

(4) Recommend to the Supreme Court the preventive suspension of any respondent in an administrative complaint pending before it.

(5) Issue *subpoena* and *subpoena duces tecum* for the appearance

and attendance of the parties and their witnesses in the investigation of administrative complaints pending before it, including the production of documents and other evidence, as may be directed.

(6) Assist the Supreme Court in the exercise of its inherent disciplinary powers under Section 11, Article VIII of the 1987 Constitution.

(7) Recommend amendments to relevant rules and issuances related to code of conduct and administrative disciplinary matters of the Judiciary; and

(8) Perform such other functions as provided for in Rule 140 of the Rules of Court, as further amended, as well as other issuances of the Supreme Court.

(B) The Judicial Integrity Officer shall exercise administrative supervision and control over the JIO's day-to-day operations, as well as over the Clerk of the JIO (CJIO) and all other officials and personnel of the JIO, subject to the supervision and control of the Supreme Court.

SECTION 5. *The Clerk of the JIO (CJIO) and the Deputy Clerk of the JIO*. — The CJIO is the administrative head of the JIO and shall be under the direct supervision of the Judicial Integrity Officer. The CJIO shall assist the Judicial Integrity Officer in the day-to-day operations of the JIO as well as in the formulation of programs and policies for the approval of the Court.

(A) The CJIO shall have the following qualifications, tenure, compensation, and functions:

(1) *Qualifications* – The CJIO shall possess the following qualifications:

(a) must be at least 40 years of age at the time of appointment;

(b) must have been engaged in the practice of law for at least 10 years;

(c) at the time of appointment, must not be related to an incumbent justice of any of the tertiary courts, or any judge of the first and second level courts, or any official or employee of the Judiciary, within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity; and

(d) must have relevant experience in the investigation

and evaluation of administrative complaints and in administration and/or management.

(2) *Tenure* – The CJIO may serve until the compulsory retirement age of 65 years, unless sooner separated from the service.

(3) *Compensation and privileges* – The CJIO shall be entitled to the compensation and benefits appurtenant to Salary Grade 29.

(4) *Functions, Duties, and Responsibilities* – The CJIO shall perform the following functions:

(a) Adjudicative Support Functions:

(i) Receive pleadings and other documents related to a complaint filed with the JIO;

(ii) Assign case docket numbers. However, if the complaint is not a verified complaint or is an anonymous complaint, without material averments readily verifiable and/or substantiated by competence evidence, the CJIO will not assign a docket number to the complaint until the requisite verification is made;

(iii) Prepare and update *rollos* for transmittal to the Judicial Integrity Officer;

(iv) Implement, monitor, and update a case management system to track, manage, and store all documents received and processed by the JIO;

(v) Prepare and issue summonses, subpoenas, resolutions, orders, and notices to the parties and offices concerned;

(vi) Issue certified true copies of resolutions, orders, indorsements, and other official records;

(vii) Transmit *rollos* and reports and recommendations of the JIO to the

Supreme Court; and

(viii) Safekeep all records, papers, and files committed to his/her charge.

(b) Non-Adjudicative Functions:

(i) Plan, direct, supervise, and coordinate the activities of all personnel of the JIO;

(ii) Manage and control the personnel, properties, and supplies of the JIO;

(iii) Act on applications for leave of absence and sign daily time records of personnel of the JIO;

(iv) Issue clearances requested by persons under the administrative jurisdiction of the Supreme Court;

(v) Study and recommend to the JIO ways and means to improve both adjudicative and administrative support; and

(vi) Perform and accomplish tasks assigned by the Judicial Integrity Officer or by the Supreme Court.

(B) The CJIO shall be assisted by a Deputy Clerk of the JIO (DCJIO) with the following qualifications, tenure, compensation, and functions:

(1) *Qualifications* – The DCJIO shall possess the following qualifications:

(a) must be at least 35 years of age at the time of appointment;

(b) must have been engaged in the practice of law for at least seven years; and

(c) at the time of appointment, must not be related to an incumbent justice of any of the tertiary courts, or any judge of the first and second level courts, or any official or employee of the Judiciary,

within the third degree of consanguinity or affinity; and

(d) must have relevant experience in the investigation and evaluation of administrative complaints and in administration and/or management.

(2) *Tenure* – The DCJIO may serve until the compulsory retirement age of 65 years, unless sooner separated from the service.

(3) *Compensation and privileges* – The DCJIO shall be entitled to the compensation and benefits appurtenant to Salary Grade 28.

(4) *Functions* – The DCJIO shall perform the following functions:

(a) Assist the CJIO in the daily operations of the Office of the CJIO;

(b) Perform the duties and responsibilities of the CJIO in the latter's absence; and

(c) Perform other tasks as may be assigned by the Judicial Integrity Officer or the CJIO.

SECTION 6. *Preliminary Grievance Conference in Complaints Involving Less Serious and Light Offenses*. — In administrative complaints involving less serious and light offenses, where the complainant and respondent belong to the same office, branch, or court station, the CJIO shall not immediately assign a docket number to the case. Instead, the case will be referred to the Judicial Integrity Officer who, in turn, shall direct the parties to undergo a mandatory preliminary grievance conference to explore the possibility of resolving the dispute.

Should there be a resolution of the dispute, and the Judicial Integrity Officer determines that there is insufficient basis to continue the administrative case, the JIO shall record such resolution, shall not proceed to docket the administrative case, and shall declare the case closed and terminated. Even if there is no resolution in the grievance conference, if the Judicial Integrity Officer finds insufficient basis to proceed with the administrative case, the complaint shall likewise not be docketed and the case shall be considered closed and terminated.

However, if there is no resolution in the grievance conference, or despite the resolution, the Judicial Integrity Officer determines that there is basis to proceed with the administrative case, the complaint shall be docketed and shall proceed.

SECTION 7. *Ad Interim Transfer of Personnel*. — The current personnel *plantilla* items under the JIB shall be transferred to the JIO in the interim, until permanent personnel *plantilla* items are created or re-assigned to the JIO, in the following manner:

(A) The *plantilla* positions in the Offices of the Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and the Regular Members of the Judicial Integrity Board, which are fixed at 6, 5, and 15, respectively, shall be transferred *ad interim* to the Office of the Judicial Integrity Officer.

(B) The *plantilla* positions in the Office of the Executive Director and the Office of the General Counsel of the JIB, which are fixed at 57 and 28, respectively, shall be transferred *ad interim* to the Office of the CJIO.

The coterminous positions attached to the positions of the Office of the Executive Director and the General Counsel of the Judicial Integrity Board shall now be attached to the Office of the CJIO of the Judicial Integrity Office.

These officials and employees shall perform functions as may be determined by the Judicial Integrity Officer and the CJIO until the JIO's staffing pattern is approved by the Civil Service Commission, and its Notice of Organization, Staffing, and Compensation Action is issued by the Department of Budget and Management (DBM).

SECTION 8. *Staffing Pattern of the JIO*. — The proposed staffing pattern shall be prepared jointly by the JIO and the Office of Administrative Services of the Supreme Court (OAS-SC) in accordance with the Index of Occupational Services and Qualification Standards prescribed by the Civil Service Commission, or those prescribed by the Supreme Court to some unique positions, whichever is applicable. The JIO and OAS-SC shall jointly submit the proposed staffing pattern to the Supreme Court for the latter's approval within six months from the effectivity of this Resolution.

SECTION 9. *Funding*. — The funding requirements for the staffing pattern of the JIO shall be initially charged against the savings of the Court, pending the issuance by the DBM of the Notice of Organization, Staffing, and Compensation Action.

SECTION 10. *Appointment of Personnel*. — The appointment of personnel of the JIO to permanent vacant positions shall be through the standard procedure of the Supreme Court's Human Resource Merit Promotion and Selection Board, except those positions that are classified by the Court as highly technical, third level positions, and coterminous or primarily confidential positions, appointments to which shall be approved by the Supreme Court *En Banc* or the three most senior members of the Supreme Court, in accordance with existing administrative issuances.

The incumbent employees of the JIB who shall be transferred *ad interim* to the JIO shall, as far as practicable, retain their seniority when the transfer is effected. In no instance shall anyone suffer a demotion.

SECTION 11. *Facilities and Properties*. — The physical offices, equipment, and supplies of the JIO shall be provided by the Supreme Court.

The present physical offices, equipment, and supplies of the JIB shall be turned over to the administration, control, and use of the JIO.

SECTION 12. *Internal Rules of the JIO*. — The Supreme Court shall create a technical working group (TWG) that shall craft the Internal Rules of the JIO within one month from the effectivity of this Resolution. The TWG, in turn, shall submit its proposed Internal Rules of the JIO to the Supreme Court within three months from the TWG's organization.

SECTION 13. *Corruption Prevention and Investigation Office Declared Functus Officio*. — Due to the enactment of Republic Act No. 11691, otherwise known as the "Judiciary Marshals Act," the pertinent provisions of the Resolution dated July 7, 2020 in A.M. No. 18-01-05-SC relative to the Corruption Prevention and Investigation Office (CPIO) are hereby declared superseded and repealed and the CPIO is accordingly declared functus officio.

SECTION 14. *Transitory Provisions*. —

(A) The Acting JIB Chairperson shall assume the functions, duties, and responsibilities of the Judicial Integrity Officer until the expiration of her current term, as provided for in A.M. No. 18-01-05-SC.

The remaining Regular Members of the JIB shall serve as consultants to the Judicial Integrity Officer for the remainder of their current terms, as provided for in A.M. No. 18-01-05-SC. They shall continue to receive all salaries, emoluments, and benefits in accordance with A.M. No. 18-01-05-SC and other pertinent issuances until the expiration of their terms.

(B) The Judicial Integrity Officer who shall first be appointed under this Resolution shall not be subject to the pretermination of term in Section 2(C) of this Resolution.

SECTION 15. *Repealing Clause*. — All administrative circulars, issuances, and orders that are inconsistent with the provisions of this Resolution are hereby repealed, amended, or superseded accordingly.

SECTION 16. *Effectivity*. — This Resolution shall take effect after 15 days following its publication in two newspapers of general circulation.

March 4, 2025

(Sgd.) ALEXANDER G. GESMUNDO
Chief Justice

(Sgd.) MARVIC M.V.F. LEONEN
Senior Associate Justice

(Sgd.) ALFREDO BENJAMIN S. CAGUIOA
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) RAMON PAUL L. HERNANDO
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) AMY C. LAZARO-JAVIER
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) HENRI JEAN PAUL B. INTING
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) RODIL V. ZALAMEDA
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) MARIO V. LOPEZ
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) SAMUEL H. GAERLAN
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) RICARDO R. ROSARIO
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) JHOSEP Y. LOPEZ
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) JAPAR B. DIMAAMPAO
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) JOSE MIDAS P. MARQUEZ
Associate Justice

(Sgd.) ANTONIO T. KHO, JR.
Associate Justice

On leave
MARIA FILOMENA D. SINGH
Associate Justice

Source: Supreme Court E-Library | Date created: April 06, 2026
This page was dynamically generated by the E-Library Content Management System