

Item No.: 39

Date: 09 2026 MAH



Republic of the Philippines
COURT OF APPEALS
Manila

FORMER
FIFTH (5th) DIVISION

RAMON C. OÑATE,
Petitioner,

CA-G.R. SP No. 186320

Members:

- versus -

HENRY I. ENCARNACION,
Respondent.

CRUZ, R.A., Chairperson,
PAYOYO-VILLORDON, T.M.B., and
SAN GASPAR-GITO, E.L., JJ.

Promulgated:

16 FEB 2026

X-----X

RESOLUTION

Cruz, R.A., J.:

This resolves the Motion for Reconsideration (Motion) filed by the respondent of Our Decision¹ which granted the Verified Petition for Review, reversed and set aside the September 12, 2024 Decision of the Office of the Ombudsman in OMB-C-A-NOV-23-0113, and dismissed the administrative complaint against the petitioner.

Respondent Henry I. Encarnacion (Encarnacion) submits that it was erroneous to dismiss the administrative complaint against Ramon C. Oñate (Oñate) as "[t]here is substantial evidence to support the finding that the petitioner is guilty of conduct prejudicial to the interest of the service and of simple neglect of duty."²

Encarnacion correctly asserts that "[i]n proceedings before administrative and quasi-judicial agencies, the quantum of evidence required to establish a fact is substantial evidence, or that level of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to justify a conclusion."³ We also agree with Encarnacion that "[t]he standard of substantial evidence is satisfied when there is reasonable ground to believe, based on the evidence submitted, that the respondent is responsible for the misconduct complained of."⁴

It was precisely through these lenses that We examined the

records and concluded, contrary to the findings of the Office of Ombudsman, that there was a lack of substantial evidence to sustain the allegations against Oñate.

In his Motion, Encarnacion keeps accusing Oñate of inaction which, by the respondent's estimation, made the petitioner guilty of negligence. Additionally, the respondent argues that the "[p]etitioner's obligation to act is not suspended by [the] filing of complaints in other forums."⁵ This particular contention reflects a short-sighted view of the judgment We rendered. Nowhere in Our Decision did We pronounce that the petitioner should be absolved from liability, if any, because of pending complaints already filed against DBSN Farms and Agriventures Corporation (DBSN Farms), which is owned by the petitioner's wife.

It bears emphasis that "the pending complaints against DBSN Farms which have already been filed before the proper authorities such as the [Department of Environment and Natural Resources] and the [Regional Trial Court] having jurisdiction over environmental cases" were brought up only to provide context to the petitioner's conduct in that "he could have simply been allowing the complaints against DBSN Farms to go through their natural course, without any undue influence or appearance of impropriety from him."⁶ The respondent seems to have glossed over our discussion highlighting the consequences of Oñate's conduct, which included, among others, the fact that:

xxx, the DENR was unhampered and freely proceeded to pass upon the grievances against DBSN Farms. The DENR was able to conduct its verification and inspection which culminated in the issuance of Notices of Violations and imposition of fines on DBSN Farms.⁷

Lastly, Encarnacion insists on the "applicability of [the] doctrine of piercing the corporate veil."⁸ Suffice it to say that this has been squarely passed upon in the Decision sought to be reconsidered. We held that "[a]s a corporation, DBSN Farms has a separate juridical personality."⁹ As such, "there is merit in the petitioner's contention that the supposed violations of DBSN Farms should not have been attributed to him."¹⁰

After perusing the issues Encarnacion raised in his Motion, We are inclined to agree with the petitioner that it deserves outright denial for failure to advance any new matter.¹¹ It is, as correctly observed by

CA-G.R. SP No. 186320
RESOLUTION

the petitioner, "a mere reiteration of recycled and previously rejected arguments."¹²

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the respondent's Motion for Reconsideration is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

ORIGINAL SIGNED
RAMON A. CRUZ
Associate Justice

WE CONCUR:

ORIGINAL SIGNED
TITA MARILYN B. PAYOYO-VILLORDON
Associate Justice

ORIGINAL SIGNED
EMILY L. SAN GASPAR-GITO
Associate Justice

¹ Promulgated on July 10, 2025, *Rollo*, Vol. IV, pp. 1403-1415.

² Motion for Reconsideration, *Rollo*, Vol. IV, p. 1424.

³ *Sagun v. Sunace International Management Services, Inc.*, G.R. No. 179242, February 23, 2011, 659 Phil. 236, cited in the Motion for Reconsideration, *Rollo*, Vol. IV, p. 1424.

⁴ *Miro v. Mendoza Vda. de Erederos, et al.*, G.R. Nos. 172532 & 172544-45, November 20, 2013, 721 Phil. 772, cited in the Motion for Reconsideration, *Rollo*, Vol. IV, p. 1424.

⁵ Motion for Reconsideration, *Rollo*, Vol. IV, p. 1426.

⁶ Our Decision, *supra* note 1 at p. 1412.

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ Motion for Reconsideration, *Rollo*, Vol. IV, p. 1429.

⁹ Our Decision, *supra* note 1 at p. 1409.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Comment (To Respondent's Motion for Reconsideration), *Rollo*, Vol. IV, p. 1434.

¹² *Id.*