



Republic of the Philippines  
Supreme Court  
Manila

FIRST DIVISION

NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

*Please take notice that the Court, First Division, issued a Resolution dated July 7, 2020 which reads as follows:*

**“G.R. No. 235777 – RUDERIC C. MARZO, petitioner, versus COURT OF APPEALS AND CELSO G. REGENCIA, respondents.**

A case becomes moot and academic when it ceases to present a justiciable controversy by virtue of supervening events, so that a declaration thereon would be of no practical use or value.<sup>1</sup> In such circumstance, courts of justice generally decline jurisdiction and no longer consider questions in which no actual interests are involved.<sup>2</sup> Here, the petitioner seeks to nullify the Court of Appeal’s (CA) Resolutions<sup>3</sup> in CA-G.R. SP No. 08088-MIN granting injunctive reliefs enjoining the Ombudsman’s Order dated March 29, 2017. Nevertheless, the CA subsequently rendered a Decision in the main case in favor of the respondent and set aside the Ombudsman Order. Later, this Court affirmed with finality the findings of the appellate court.

Without doubt, this Court’s final judgment affirming the CA’s Decision rendered the assailed injunctive reliefs permanent. It has now removed any actual controversy between the parties<sup>4</sup> and rendered the Resolution of the instant petition for *certiorari* superfluous and unnecessary.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, it becomes pointless and unrealistic to insist on giving due course to the petition and permit a

- over – two (2) pages ...

65-B

<sup>1</sup> *So v. Hon. Tacla, Jr., et al.*, 648 Phil. 149, 163 (2010), citing *David v. Macapagal-Arroyo*, 522 Phil. 705 (2006).

<sup>2</sup> *Soriano Vda. de Dabao v. Court of Appeals*, 469 Phil. 928, 937 (2004).

<sup>3</sup> *Rollo*, pp. 34-40, 80-83, and 98-100.

<sup>4</sup> *Ozaeta v. Oil Industry Commission*, 187 Phil. 282, 287-288 (1980).

<sup>5</sup> *Camutin et al. v. Sps. Potente*, 597 Phil. 143, 148 (2009).

A small, handwritten signature or mark in the bottom right corner of the page.

review on the propriety of the issuance of the injunctive reliefs. Differently stated, any Decision upon the merits of the petition would serve no useful purpose,<sup>6</sup> and the grant of any actual substantial relief is no longer feasible.

**FOR THESE REASONS**, the petition is **DISMISSED**.

**SO ORDERED.”**

**By authority of the Court:**

  
**LIBRADA C. BUENA**  
Division Clerk of Court

by:

**MARIA TERESA B. SIBULO**  
Deputy Division Clerk of Court  
**65-B**

Atty. Tomas O. Cabili  
Counsel for Petitioner  
Tambo Road (Nr. Bus Terminal)  
Brgy. Hinaplanon, 9200 Iligan City

Atty. Moises Dalisay, Jr.  
Co-Counsel for Petitioner  
0009 San Miguel Village, Pala-o  
9200 Iligan City

Court of Appeals  
9000 Cagayan de Oro City  
(CA-G.R. SP No. 08088-MIN)

Atty. Voltaire I. Rovira  
Counsel for Respondent  
0042 San Miguel Street, Poblacion  
9200 Iligan City

OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN  
Ombudsman Building, Agham Road  
Diliman, 1101 Quezon City  
(OMB-M-C-15-0422)

OFFICE OF THE OMBUDSMAN  
– MINDANAO  
8000 Davao City  
(OMB-M-A-15-0514)

Public Information Office (x)  
Library Services (x)  
Supreme Court  
(For uploading pursuant to A.M.  
No. 12-7-1-SC)

Judgment Division (x)  
Supreme Court

UR

<sup>6</sup> *Philippine Sugar Institute (PHILSUGIN) v. Association of PHILSUGIN Employees (ASPEM)*, et al., 201 Phil. 416, 417 (1982).