Supreme Court E-Library

first instance from assuming cognizance over such a matter.' Reference was then made in the opinion to previous cases."[12]

WHEREFORE, this petition for *certiorari* and prohibition is granted and the orders, the first issued by respondent Judge Juan Bocar on May 19, 1972 in Civil Case No. 82880, and the second issued by respondent Judge Mariano V. Benedicto in Civil Case No. 84206 on May 30, 1972 are nullified, set aside and declared to be without any force and effect. The restraining orders issued by this Court on July 11, 1972, as well as on August 8, 1972 are hereby made permanent. Costs against private respondents.

Barredo, Antonio, Aquino, Concepcion Jr., and *Abad Santos, JJ.*, concur.

Santos, J., is on official leave.

SECOND DIVISION

[Adm. Case No. 1053. September 7, 1979]

SANTA PANGAN, *complainant, vs.* **ATTY. DIONISIO RAMOS,** *respondent.*

SYLLABUS

LEGAL ETHICS; ATTORNEYS; A LAWYER IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO USE A NAME OTHER THAN THE ONE INSCRIBED IN

---

[12] *Ibid.*, 268-269. *Pacis*, L-22526, is reported in 18 SCRA 907; *Auyong Hian*, L-25181, is reported in 19 SCRA 10; *Gale*, is reported in 24 Phil. 95; *Vinuya*, L-29043, is reported in 37 SCRA 381. Outside of Pacis, the following cases were cited: *De Joya v. Lantin*, L-24037, April 27, 1967, 19 SCRA 893; *Romualdez v. Arca*, L-20516, Nov. 15, 1967, 21 SCRA 856; *Diosamito v. Balanque*, L-30734, July 28, 1969, 28 SCRA 836; and *de Joya v. David*, L-23504, Dec. 29, 1967, 21 SCRA 1493.

Supreme Court E-Library

THE ROLL OF ATTORNEYS IN HIS PRACTICE OF LAW; CASE AT BAR.— The name appearing in the "Roll of Attorneys" is "Dionisio D. Ramos." The attorney's roll or register is the official record containing the names and signatures of those who are authorized to practice law. A lawyer is not authorized to use a name other than the one inscribed in the Roll of Attorneys in his practice of law. The official oath obliges the attorney solemnly to swear that he "will do no falsehood." As an officer in the temple of justice, an attorney has irrefragable obligations of "truthfulness, candor and frankness." Indeed, candor and frankness should characterize the conduct of the lawyer at every stage. This has to be so because the court has the right to rely upon him in ascertaining the truth. In representing himself to the court as "Pedro D.D. Ramos" instead of "Dionisio D. Ramos," respondent has violated his solemn oath. The duty of an attorney to the courts to employ, for the purpose of maintaining the causes confided to him, such means as are consistent with truth and honor, cannot be overemphasized. These injunctions circumscribe the general duty of entire devotion of the attorney to the client. As stated in a case, his "high vocation is to correctly inform the court upon the law and the facts of the case, and to aid it in doing justice and arriving at correct conclusions. He violates his oath of office when he resorts to deception, or permits his client to do so." In using the name of "Pedro D.D. Ramos" before the courts instead of the name by which he was authorized to practice law — Dionisio D. Ramos — respondent in effect resorted to deception. He demonstrated lack of candor in dealing with the courts. The circumstance that this is his first aberration in this regard precludes Us from imposing a more severe penalty. WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, respondent Dionisio D. Ramos is severely REPRIMANDED and warned that a repetition of the same overt act may warrant his suspension or disbarment from the practice of law.

R E S O L U T I O N

ANTONIO, *J.*:

This has reference to the motion of complainant, Santa Pangan, to cite respondent Dionisio Ramos for contempt. It appears

Supreme Court E-Library

from the record that on September 7, 1978 and March 13, 1979, the hearings in this administrative case were postponed on the basis of respondent's motions for postponement. These motions were predicated on respondent's allegations that on said dates he had a case set for hearing before Branch VII, Court of First Instance of Manila, entitled *People v. Marieta M. Isip* (Criminal Case No. 35906). Upon verification, the attorney of record of the accused in said case is one "Atty. Pedro D.D. Ramos, 306 Doña Salud Bldg., Dasmariñas, Manila." Respondent admits that he used the name of "Pedro D.D. Ramos" before said court in connection with Criminal Case No. 35906, but avers that he had a right to do so because in his Birth Certificate (Annex "A"), his name is "Pedro Dionisio Ramos," and his parents are Pedro Ramos and Carmen Dayaw, and that the "D.D." in "Pedro D.D. Ramos" is but an abbreviation of "Dionisio Dayaw," his other given name and maternal surname.

This explanation of respondent is untenable. The name appearing in the "Roll of Attorneys" is "Dionisio D. Ramos." The attorney's roll or register is the official record containing the names and signatures of those who are authorized to practice law. A lawyer is not authorized to use a name other than the one inscribed in the Roll of Attorneys in his practice of law.

The official oath obliges the attorney solemnly to swear that he "will do no falsehood." As an officer in the temple of justice, an attorney has irrefragable obligations of "truthfulness, candor and frankness."[1] Indeed, candor and frankness should characterize the conduct of the lawyer at every stage. This has to be so because the court has the right to rely upon him in ascertaining the truth. In representing himself to the court as "Pedro D.D. Ramos" instead of "Dionisio D. Ramos," respondent has violated his solemn oath.

The duty of an attorney to the courts to employ, for the purpose of maintaining the causes confided to him, such means

---

[1] Jessup, *Professional Ideals of the Lawyer 18*, Malcolm, *Legal and Judicial Ethics*, 116-120.

Supreme Court E-Library

as are consistent with truth and honor, cannot be overemphasized. These injunctions circumscribe the general duty of entire devotion of the attorney to the client. As stated in a case, his "high vocation is to correctly inform the court upon the law and the facts of the case, and to aid it in doing justice and arriving at correct conclusions. He violates his oath of office when he resorts to deception, or permits his client to do so."[2]

In using the name of "Pedro D.D. Ramos" before the courts instead of the name by which he was authorized to practice law — Dionisio D. Ramos — respondent in effect resorted to deception. He demonstrated lack of candor in dealing with the courts. The circumstance that this is his first aberration in this regard precludes Us from imposing a more severe penalty.

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, respondent Dionisio D. Ramos is severely REPRIMANDED and warned that a repetition of the same overt act may warrant his suspension or disbarment from the practice of law.

It appearing that the hearing of this case has been unduly delayed, the Investigator of this Court is directed forthwith to proceed with the hearing to terminate it as soon as possible. The request of complainant to appear in the aforementioned hearing, assisted by her counsel, Atty. Jose U. Lontoc, is hereby granted.

SO ORDERED.

Barredo (Chairman), Concepcion Jr., and *Abad Santos, JJ.*, concur.

Aquino, J., in the result.

Santos, J., is on official leave.

---

[2] *People v. Beattie*, 137 Ill. 553, 31 Am. St. Rep. 384.