

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES SUPREME COURT Manila

SUPREME COURT OF THE PHILIPPINES

SECOND DIVISION

NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

Please take notice that the Court, Second Division, issued a Resolution dated 11 December 2019 which reads as follows:

"G.R. No. 249968 (Franklin Noel Pinacate Trazo v. RR Donnelley, Inc., Kevin Bucknor, Maria Lourdes Arespacochaga, and Namita Sharma)

After a judicious study of the case, the Court resolves to DISMISS the instant petition¹ for being the wrong mode of review in assailing the May 21, 2019 Decision² and the September 3, 2019 Resolution³ of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. SP No. 157510, considering that petitioner Franklin Noel Pinacate Trazo (petitioner) should have availed of a petition for review on certiorari under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court (Rule 45 Petition). It is settled that the extraordinary remedy of certiorari would not lie if there is a plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, 4 as in this case.

In any event, even if the instant petition is treated as a Rule 45 Petition, the Court nonetheless finds no reversible error on the part of the CA in rendering the assailed rulings. As correctly ruled by the CA, (a) petitioner failed to prove that his resignation was forcibly brought about by serious acts of insult, disdain, and discrimination on the part of the officers of respondent RR Donnelley, Inc. (RR Donnelley);⁵ and (b) his transfers from one department to another was without demotion in rank nor diminution in salary, and thus, conformably within the proper exercise of RR Donnelley's management prerogative. 6 Case law provides that a claim of constructive dismissal must be substantiated with clear and convincing evidence, absent which, the resignation of an employee is presumed to be voluntary. 7 Settled is the rule that the management has the prerogative to transfer an employee from one office to another within the business establishment, provided there is no demotion in rank or a diminution of salary, benefits, and other privileges.8 It bears stressing that factual findings of the labor tribunals or agencies, especially when affirmed by the CA, are accorded not only with respect, but also with finality by the Court,9 as in this case.

Rollo, pp. 3-97.

Id. at 553-564. Penned by Associate Justice Stephen C. Cruz with Associate Justices Pedro B. Corales and Germano Francisco D. Legaspi, concurring.

Id. at 601-602.

See Republic v. Yang Chi Hao, 617 Phil. 422, 432 (2009).

See rollo, pp. 560-561.

See id. at 562.

See Kondo v. Toyota Boshoku (Phils.) Corporation, G.R. No. 201396, September 11, 2019.

See Marsman & Co., Inc. v. Sta. Rita, G.R. No. 194765, April 23, 2018, 862 SCRA 211, 229.

See Superior Packaging Corporation v. Balagsay, 697 Phil. 62, 68-69 (2012).

SO ORDERED."

Very truly yours,

TERESITA AQUINO TUAZON

Deputy Division Clerk of Court Uth 12/26

YDEC 2019

ATTY. FRANKLIN NOEL P. TRAZO (reg) Counsel for Petitioners Block 11, Lot 7, Lapu-Lapu St. New Capitol Estates I Batasan Hills, Quezon City

PUNO & PUNO LAW OFFICES (reg) Counsel for Respondent 33rd Floor, The Podium West Tower 12 ADB Avenue, Ortigas Center Mandaluyong City, 1550 Metro Manila

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS COMMISSION (reg) PPSTA Building, Banawe Street corner Quezon Boulevard 1100 Quezon City (NLRC NCR Case No. 04-05755-17/ NLRC LAC No. 01-000355-18) JUDGMENT DIVISION (x) Supreme Court, Manila

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE (x) LIBRARY SERVICES (x) [For uploading pursuant to A.M. No. 12-7-1-SC]

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ATTORNEY (x)
OFFICE OF THE REPORTER (x)
Supreme Court, Manila

COURT OF APPEALS (x) Ma. Orosa Street Ermita, 1000 Manila CA-G.R. SP No. 157510

Please notify the Court of any change in your address. GR249968. 12/11/19B(175)_{URES}