Republic of the Philippines
Supreme Court
Manila

EN BANC

JUDGE RAY ALAN T. DRILON and ATTY. CORAZON P. ROMERO,
Complainants,

-versus-

ATTY. ARIEL D. MAGLALANG,
Respondent.

A.C. No. 8471

Members:

GESMUNDO, *Chief Justice*
LEONEN,
CAGUIOA,
HERNANDO,
LAZARO-JAVIER,
INTING,*
ZALAMEDA,
LOPEZ, M.,
GAERLAN,
ROSARIO,
LOPEZ, J.,
DIMAAMPAO,
MARQUEZ,
KHO, JR., and
SINGH, *JJ.*

Promulgated:

August 22, 2023

x - x

DECISION

***PER CURIAM*:**

In their Complaint-Affidavit[1] dated September 2, 2019, Judge Ray Alan T. Drilon (Judge Drilon), and Clerk of Court V Atty. Corazon P. Romero (Atty. Romero), both of Regional Trial Court, Branch 41, Bacolod City

---

* On leave.

1 *Rollo*, pp. 4–12.

charged Atty. Ariel D. Maglalang (Atty. Maglalang) with fabrication of Order[2] dated August 2, 2006 in Civil Case No. 206-16977 (Forged Order), a non-existent case, which was supposedly docketed in their court.[3]

The Forged Order, signed by "Presiding Judge ALAN RAY DRILON" declared the presumptive death of Ruby S. Madrinian (Madrinian) apparently upon the petition of his wife, Jodee Andren (Andren).[4] It stated:

> As the Petitioner, strongly believes that her husband is now dead for legal purposes, the Court put its wisdom on the same ground. Petition proved that the [r]espondent has been absence [sic] for almost seven (7) years without any communication. Such actuation cannot be tolerated by a normal individual, much with us as Filipinos wherein close-family-ties has been deeply inflicted [sic] and has become our social norms.
>
> In accordance with Article 390 of the Civil Code, after an absence of seven years, it being unknown whether or not the absentee still lives, he shall be presumed dead for all purposes, except for those succession [sic].
>
> ***WHEREFORE***, premises considered, ***ORDER*** is hereby issued declaring Respondent **RUBY S. MADRINIAN** as ***ABSENTEE*** and accordingly presume[d] dead for all legal purposes [sic].
>
> Let a copy of this Order be served to the National Statistic Office [sic] and to the Office of the Solicitor General.[5] (Emphasis and italics in the original)

Sometime in July 2008, Judge Drilon and Atty. Romero retrieved a copy of the Forged Order. Upon verification, the Office of the Clerk of Court, Regional Trial Court, Bacolod City issued a Certificate[6] dated July 16, 2008 that there was no case docketed as Civil Case No. 206-16977, entitled "*Jodee P. Andren versus Ruby S. Madrinian.*"[7] They also made the following observations with respect to the Forged Order:

> a) The case number is not in consonance with the chronological numbering of cases with the Office of the Clerk of Court, RTC-Bacolod City;
>
> b) The signature appearing on the forged order is not the signature of Judge Ray Alan T. Drilon;
>
> c) The full name of the Judge is RAY ALAN T. DRILON and not Alan Ray Drilon as appearing in the fake court order;
>
> d) The way the spurious court order is written is much different from the way Judge Ray Alan T. Drilon writes his orders or resolutions; [and]

---

2 *Id.* at 18–19.
3 *Id.* at 4.
4 *Id.* at 205.
5 *Id.* at 86.
6 *Id.* at 22.
7 *Id.* at 4.

e) The heading and caption appearing in the fake order is different from the format the court is using.[8]

Thereafter, Judge Drilon and Atty. Romero sought the assistance of the National Bureau of Investigation (NBI) to investigate the matter.[9]

The NBI then submitted a report which contained, among others, the sworn statements of Andren, and Nenita Kho-Artizano (Kho-Artizano). In her Sworn Statement[10] dated April 2, 2009, Andren identified Atty. Maglalang as the person who gave her the Forged Order, *viz.*:

Q: I will show you a copy of an Order signed by Judge ALAN RAY DRILON dated August 2, 2006, do you recognize this Order?

A: Yes, Sir because it is a copy of the Order given to me by my lawyer ATTY. ARIEL MAGLALANG in November 2006.

x x x x

Q: Will you please narrate the circumstances of [how Atty.] ARIEL MAGLALANG gave you a falsified Order from Judge DRILON?

A: Sometime in the last week of February 2006, ATTY. ARIEL MAGLALANG was referred to me by a friend to handle my annulment case as I was going to file an annulment case against my former husband RUBY MADRINIAN. Sometime in March 2006, I met ATTY. MAGLALANG and he told me that he will handle my case [for Php 100,000.00] (ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND PESOS) assuring me that it will be approved in three months['] time. He asked for a fifty per cent down payment but I could only afford [Php 30,000.00] (THIRTY THOUSAND PESOS). I gave him the [Php 30,000.00] and he told me that he [would] take care of everything and [that] there is no need for my personal appearance. After a month passed[,] I made a follow-up and ATTY. MAGLALANG said that Judge DRILON is very busy. He told me that he will arrange for me to [meet] with Judge DRILON so that I can appeal to [him] to speed up my annulment case but the meeting never happened. I kept on making follow-ups with ATTY. MAGLALANG but he [kept] on making excuses. Sometime in August 2006[,] ATTY. MAGLALANG told me that he knows somebody at NSO who can make [a] correction [on] my records and that he can expedite for the amount of [Php 70,000.00] (SEVENTY THOUSAND PESOS). I [gave] him the [Php 70,000.00] and he [gave] me an acknowledgement receipt.

x x x x

Q: After you have given the [Php 70,000.00] to ATTY. MAGLALANG, what happened next?

---

8 *Id.*
9 *Id.* at 205.
10 *Id.* at 167–169.

A: ATTY. MAGLALANG assured me that the NSO record is [okay] and set the date for my marriage. He convinced me to have the wedding in Manila so that my documents will be expedited and asked for [Php 50,000.00] (FIFTY THOUSAND PESOS) package deal for the wedding and set the date for the wedding on August 22, 2006. On August 20, 2006[,] JOHN RAY WISKUS arrived and we got married at Manila City Hall with ATTY. MAGLALANG also as one of the witnesses.

Q: After the wedding, which was facilitated by ATTY. MAGLALANG, what happened next?

A: **I asked for a copy of my annulment order from ATTY. MAGLALANG and after many follow-ups he gave me my annulment order signed by Judge DRILON sometime in November 2006** and I then flew to Kuwait to join my husband there. Sometime in March 2008[,] I was about to file my immigrant visa to the [United] States and I asked Nanay NENITA ARTIZANO, who is my caretaker in the Philippines, to get a copy of my corrected and updated record at NSO and to my surprise it was neither corrected nor annulled despite of the assurances and the order of annulment given to me by ATTY. MAGLALANG. I hired ATTY. BIMBO LAVIDEZ to verify the validity of the annulment order signed by Judge DRILON given to me by ATTY. MAGLALANG and **it was then [that] I found out that the order was fake and that no petition for annulment was filed by my lawyer ATTY. MAGLALANG in the sala of Judge DRILON.**

Q: At the moment we have nothing more to ask from you[. Is] there anything more that you want to add, delete or correct in your statement?

A: Yes Sir, I would like to give you a copy of ATTY. [MAGLALANG's] photo taken after the reception during my wedding in Manila.[11] x x x (Emphasis supplied)

Andren identified the Acknowledgement Receipt[12] dated August 11, 2006 issued by Atty. Maglalang for the PHP 70,000.00 he received from her "for the correction of [her] public records."[13] She also identified the photograph of herself and Atty. Maglalang taken at her wedding.[14]

In her Sworn Statement[15] dated April 3, 2009, Kho-Artizano corroborated the statements of Andren, thus:

Q: Ngaa ari ka diri sa opisina sang NBI Bacolod District Office? (Why are you here at the NBI Bacolod District Office?)

A: Para maghatag sang akon salaysay sang paghatag ni ATTY. ARIEL MAGLALANG kay JODEE ANDREN-WISKUS sang order halin kay Judge DRILON nga sang ulihi amon nahibal-an nga fake gali. (To give

---

11 *Id.* at 167–168.
12 *Id.* at 34.
13 *Id.* at 6–7 and 34.
14 *Id.* at 7–8.
15 *Id.* at 172–174.

my statement of how ATTY. ARIEL MAGLALANG gave to JODEE ANDREN-WISKUS an order from Judge DRILON which we later found out to be fake).

x x x x

Q: Mahimo mo bala masaysay kun paano ginhatag kay JODEE ni ATTY. MAGLALANG ang order halin kay Judge DRILON nga sang ulihi inyo nahial-an nga fake? (Will you please narrate how ATTY. MAGLALANG gave to JODEE the Order from Judge DRILON which was later found out to be fake?)

A: Sang Nobyembre 2006 nagkadto si ATTY. MAGLALANG sa balay ni JODEE sa Villa Angela kag ginhatag niya kay JODEE ang Order halin kay Judge DRILON. Akon gid nakita ang paghatag niya sang Order kay dira man ako naga-istar. Sang sunod nga adlaw nag flight dayon si JODEE sa Kuwait. (On November 2006[,] ATTY. MAGLALANG went to the house of JODEE at Villa Angela and he gave to JODEE an Order from Judge DRILON. I saw him give the Order because I also live in the house. The following day JODEE took a flight to Kuwait).

Q: Mahimo mo bala masaysay kun paano nadiskobrihan nga fake ang Order halin kay Judge DRILON nga ginhatag ni ATTY. MAGLALANG kay JODEE (Will you please narrate how the Order from Judge DRILON which ATTY. MAGLALANG gave to JODEE was found out to be fake?)

A: Sang March 2008[,] ginsugo ako ni JODEE nga mag follow-up sa NSO sang iya Marriage Contract kag didto ko nadiskobrihan [nga wala] [makoreksiyonan] ang iya NSO record kay nagguwa pa ang iya daan nga kasal nga may Order na nga ginhatag si ATTY. MAGLALANG halin kay Judge DRILON. (On March 2008[,] JODEE asked me to follow-up at NSO her marriage contract and it was then that I discovered that the NSO record was not corrected because that old marriage was still there despite the Order from Judge DRILON which ATTY. MAGLALANG [gave] to JODEE).

Q: Ano ang masunod nga natabo? (What happened next?)

A: Ginsugo ako ni JODEE nga mangita sang abogado para mag check sang papeles kag ako gin refer kay ATTY. BIMBO LAVIDEZ. Ginpangita ni ATTY. LAVIDEZ ang mga dokumento nahanungod sa Annulment ni JODEE apang nadiskobrihan nga wala sang na file sa sala ni Judge DRILON kag wala man si Judge naka-hatag sang Order tungod kay wala man kaso nga na file si ATTY. MAGLALANG sa iya sala. **(JODEE asked me to look for a lawyer to check the papers and I was referred to ATTY. BIMBO LAVIDEZ. ATTY. LAVIDEZ looked for the documents relative to the annulment of JODEE but he discovered that it was not filed [in] the sala of Judge DRILON and Judge DRILON has not issued any Order because no case for annulment was filed before his sala by ATTY. MAGLALANG).**[16] (Emphasis supplied)

---

[16] *Id.* at 172–173.

The National Statistics Office (NSO) issued a Certification[17] dated May 15, 2008 that as of April 30, 2008, their records showed that Andren was married to one Ruby Sabandal Madrinian.

By Resolution[18] dated August 14, 2019, the case was referred to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines (IBP) for investigation, report, and recommendation. The IBP – Commission on Bar Discipline (IBP-CBD) then required the parties to submit their mandatory conference briefs. Upon receipt of the other party's mandatory conference brief, the parties were also given the opportunity to submit a Reply.[19]

In his Mandatory Conference Brief[20] dated March 7, 2021, Atty. Maglalang averred that he had relocated to Manila for several years and had not received a copy of the complaint against him.[21] Too, the documents submitted before the IBP-CBD were merely copies, and were blurred and incomplete.[22] Finally, he claimed, among others, that: (a) he did not personally know Andren or Kho-Artizano; and, (b) there was no engagement contract showing that Andren availed of his services for her annulment case.[23]

Neither party filed a Reply within the designated period. Considering the health risks brought by the COVID-19 pandemic, the IBP-CBD deemed the mandatory conference terminated without need of further hearing.[24]

Report and Recommendation of the IBP

In its Report and Recommendation[25] dated August 10, 2022, the IBP-CBD found that Atty. Maglalang "resorted to [taking] short cuts" by "[making use of a] non-existent order and furnished his client with the same."[26] In so concluding, the IBP-CBD considered:

> 1. The name of the judge was written "Alan Ray Drilon" rather than "Ray Alan Drilon;"
> 2. The signature of the Complainant [Judge does] not appear to be his as can be gleaned on all the documents presented;
> 3. The manner and style as to how the order was written was different from the style traditionally adopted by the Complainant;

---

17 *Id.* at 20.
18 *Id.* at 65.
19 *Id.* at 119.
20 *Id.* at 126–129.
21 *Id.* at 126.
22 *Id.*
23 *Id.* at 127.
24 *Id.* at 119–120.
25 *Id.* at 205–210; By Commissioner Maria Editha A. Go-Binas.
26 *Id.* at 209.

> 4. Certification issued by ILDEFONSO M. VILLANUEVA, JR., CLERK OF COURT VI of the Regional Trial Court[,] 6th [J]udicial [R]egion attesting to the fact that the office does not have any record in connection with Civil Case No. 206-16977 entitled Jodee P. Andren vs. Ruby S. Madrinian for Presumptive [D]eath; [and],
>
> 5. Certification issued by Corazon C. Pagulayan-Torres, Clerk of [C]ourt V of the same Regional Trial Court, certifying that there "is no case filed in the office[."][27]

Consequently, the IBP-CBD recommended that a penalty of one-year suspension be imposed upon Atty. Maglalang for fabricating the Forged Order.[28]

By Extended Resolution[29] dated May 8, 2023, the IBP Board of Governors (IBP-BOG) resolved to adopt the factual findings of the IBP-CBD since Atty. Maglalang only interposed "pure denial."[30] It however modified the recommended penalty to disbarment.[31] It found that suspension for one year was too light a penalty for the "deplorable conduct of deceitful behavior in falsifying papers of the [J]udiciary."[32] As well, the ultimate penalty of disbarment was meted out to lawyers who were similarly found to have falsified court papers or decisions.[33]

Our Ruling

We adopt the factual findings and conclusions of the IBP-CBD, and the penalty recommended by the IBP-BOG.

The Court is constitutionally-mandated to discipline erring lawyers and purge the legal profession of its unworthy members.[34] In exercising disciplinary power, the Court calls upon members of the Bar to account for their actuations as officers of the Court with a view of preserving the purity of the legal profession and the proper and honest administration of justice.[35]

---

27 *Id.* at 208.
28 *Id.* at 209–210.
29 *Id.* at 211–216; Prepared by IBP-BOG Deputy Director Patrick M. Velez.
30 *Id.* at 212–213.
31 *Id.* at 214.
32 *Id.* at 213.
33 *Id.* at 215.
34 *Development Bank of the Philippines v. Atty. Badilla*, A.C. No. 10931, September 29, 2021 [Resolution, First Division], citing *Republic v. Sereno*, 833 Phil. 449 (2018) [Per *J.* Tijam, *En Banc*].
35 *Bartolome v. Rojas*, A.C. No. 13226, October 4, 2022 [Per Curiam, *En Banc*], citing *Reyes v. Atty. Nieva*, 794 Phil. 360, 379 (2016) [Per *J.* Perlas-Bernabe, *En Banc*].

Previously, a lawyer's worthiness to remain as such was measured against the Code of Professional Responsibility which was promulgated on June 21, 1988. Thirty-four years later, or on April 11, 2023, the Court promulgated the Code of Professional Responsibility and Accountability (CPRA).[36] It took effect on May 29, 2023[37] and explicitly states that its provisions shall be applied to all pending and future cases, except to the extent that its retroactive application would not be feasible or would work injustice, in which case the procedure under which the cases were filed shall govern.[38]

The CPRA, like its precursor enjoins lawyers from performing improper acts, such as the falsification of court decisions,[39] *viz.*:

> CANON II
> *Propriety*
>
> A lawyer shall, at all times, act with propriety and maintain the appearance of propriety in personal and professional dealings, observe honesty, respect and courtesy, and uphold the dignity of the legal profession consistent with the highest standards of ethical behavior. (n)
>
> SECTION 1. *Proper Conduct.* — A lawyer shall not engage in unlawful, dishonest, immoral, or deceitful conduct. (1.01)
>
> SECTION 2. *Dignified Conduct.* — A lawyer shall respect the law, the courts, tribunals, and other government agencies, their officials, employees, and processes, and act with courtesy, civility, fairness, and candor towards fellow members of the bar. (8a)
>
> A lawyer shall not engage in conduct that adversely reflects on one's fitness to practice law, nor behave in a scandalous manner, whether in public or private life, to the discredit of the legal profession. (7.03a)
>
> x x x x
>
> SECTION 5. *Observance of Fairness and Obedience.* — A lawyer shall, in every personal and professional engagement, insist on the observance of the principles of fairness and obedience to the law.
>
> x x x x
>
> SECTION 8. *Prohibition against Misleading the Court, Tribunal, or Other Government Agency.* — A lawyer shall not misquote, misrepresent, or mislead the court as to the existence or the contents of any document, argument, evidence, law, or other legal

---

36 Code of Professional Responsibility and Accountability, OCA Circular No. 200-2023, May 19, 2023.
37 *Id.*
38 CPRA General Provisions, Section 1.
39 See CPRA, Canon VI, Section 33(b); See *also* footnote 159 of the CPRA.

> authority, or pass off as one's own the ideas or words of another, or assert as a fact that which has not been proven. (10.02a)
>
> CANON III
> *Fidelity*
>
> Fidelity pertains to a lawyer's duty to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the land, to assist in the administration of justice as an officer of the court, and to advance or defend a client's cause, with full devotion, genuine interest, and zeal in the pursuit of truth and justice. (n) x x x
>
> SECTION 2. *The Responsible and Accountable Lawyer.* — A lawyer shall uphold the constitution, obey the laws of the land, promote respect for laws and legal processes, safeguard human rights, and at all times advance the honor and integrity of the legal profession.
>
> As an officer of the court, a lawyer shall uphold the rule of law and conscientiously assist in the speedy and efficient administration of justice. (12a)
>
> As an advocate, a lawyer shall represent the client with fidelity and zeal within the bounds of the law and the CPRA. (17a, 19a)

There is substantial evidence i.e., "that amount of relevant evidence which a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to justify a conclusion"[40] that Atty. Maglalang authored and used the Forged Order. *One*. Andren and Kho-Artizano both identified Atty. Maglalang as the source of the Forged Order.[41] Such fact was confirmed by the NBI in a Letter dated April 7, 2009,[42] *viz.*:

> Confidential [i]nvestigation conducted by this Command disclosed that the fake or forged order was given by ATTY. ARIEL D. MAGLALANG to JODEE P. ANDREN sometime in November 2006.[43]

In this regard, it is a well-settled rule that, in the absence of satisfactory explanation, one who is found in possession of a forged document and who used or uttered it is presumed to be the forger.[44]

Another. The Office of the Clerk of Court, Regional Trial Court, Bacolod City issued two Certificates[45] dated July 16, 2008 and April 16,

---

40 See *Partsch v. Atty. Vitorillo*, A.C. No. 10897, January 4, 2022 [Per *J.* Hernando, *En Banc*], citing *Spouses Nocuenca v. Bensi*, A.C. No. 12609, February 10, 2020 [Per *J.* Hernando, *En Banc*].

41 *Rollo*, pp. 167–169 and 172–174.

42 *Id.* at 30.

43 *Id.*

44 *Sunga v. People*, G.R. No. 265764, June 14, 2023 [Notice, First Division], citing *Bresenio v. People*, G.R. No. 241336, June 16, 2021 [Resolution, Third Division].

45 *Rollo*, pp. 22 and 15.

2009, respectively, which both confirmed that Civil Case No. 206-16977 was not filed nor docketed thereat.

Finally. Judge Drilon, under whose name the Forged Order was purportedly issued, disclaimed any involvement in the preparation thereof. More important, Judge Drilon and Atty. Romero, who are in the best position to know the procedures observed in their court, unequivocally stated that:

> a) The case number is not in consonance with the chronological numbering of cases with the Office of the Clerk of Court, RTC-Bacolod City;
>
> b) The signature appearing on the forged order is not the signature of Judge Ray Alan T. Drilon;
>
> c) The full name of the Judge is RAY ALAN T. DRILON and not Alan Ray Drilon as appearing in the fake court order;
>
> d) The way the spurious court order is written is much different from the way Judge Ray Alan T. Drilon writes his orders or resolutions; [and]
>
> e) The heading and caption appearing in the fake order is different from the format the court is using.[46]

In response, Atty. Maglalang merely denied the accusations against him. His cursory denial of the allegations against him carries little weight[47] compared to the testimonial and documentary evidence adduced by Judge Drilon and Atty. Romero. Indeed, Atty. Maglalang had multiple opportunities to directly address the allegations against him, but he merely glossed them over.[48] Instead of meaningfully refuting the allegations, he engaged in a perfunctory denial thereof. Said denial is tantamount to a general denial because the matters involved are so plainly and necessarily within his personal knowledge.[49] As such, he is deemed to have tacitly admitted the allegation that he was the source of the Forged Order.[50]

On this score, Atty. Maglalang's authorship and use of the Forged Order contravene Sections 1, 2, 5, and 8 of Canon II, and Section 2 Canon III of the CPRA. In *Vasco-Tamaray v. Atty. Daquis*,[51] the Court ordained:

---

46 *Id.* at 4.

47 See *Neri, et al. v. Judge Macabaya*, A.M. No. RTJ-16-2475, February 4, 2020 [Per Curiam, *En Banc*].

48 *Id.*

49 See *YKR Corporation, et al. v. Philippine Agri-Business Center Corporation*, 745 Phil. 666 (2014) [Per *J.* Villarama, Jr., Third Division], citing *Capitol Motors Corporation v. Yabut*, 143 Phil. 1 (1970) [Per *J.* Villamor, *En Banc*].

50 *Id.*

51 779 Phil. 191 (2016) [Per Curiam, *En Banc*], citing *Yupangco-Nakpil v. Uy*, 743 Phil. 138 (2014) [Per *J.* Perlas-Bernabe, First Division].

> Verily, members of the Bar are expected at all times to uphold the integrity and dignity of the legal profession and refrain from **any act or omission which might lessen the trust and confidence reposed by the public in the fidelity, honesty, and integrity of the legal profession**. By no insignificant measure, respondent blemished not only his integrity as a member of the Bar, but also that of the legal profession. In other words, his conduct fell short of the exacting standards expected of him as a guardian of law and justice.[52] (Emphasis and underscoring supplied)

Indubitably, Atty. Maglalang's acts ultimately bring the legal profession into disrepute.[53] His acts evince his disrespect for the rule of law and the courts. Further, his use of the Forged Order reflects poorly on his fitness to practice law, and brings discredit upon the entire legal profession.

The Proper Penalty

Under the CPRA, falsification of documents such as court decisions or orders is considered a serious offense.[54] Section 37(b) of Canon VI of the CPRA provides that a respondent found guilty of a serious offense may be sanctioned with any or a combination of the following penalties: (a) disbarment; (b) suspension from the practice of law for a period exceeding six months; (c) revocation of notarial commission and disqualification as notary public for not less than two years; or (d) a fine exceeding PHP 100,000.00.

In *Reyes v. Atty. Rivera*,[55] *Taday v. Apoya, Jr.*,[56] *Madria v. Rivera*,[57] and *Billanes v. Latido*,[58] all of which have similar facts as here, the Court disbarred respondent-lawyers for falsifying court orders and decisions in relation to their clients' nullity of marriage cases.

So must it be.

ACCORDINGLY, the Court finds Atty. Ariel D. Maglalang **GUILTY** of violation of Sections 1, 2, 5, and 8 of Canon II, and Section 2 of Canon III of the Code of Professional Responsibility and Accountability. He is **DISBARRED** from the practice of law and his name is ordered **STRICKEN OFF** from the Roll of Attorneys, effective immediately.

---

52 *Id.* at 205; *Id.* at 114.

53 See *Vasco-Tamaray v. Atty. Daquis*, *id.*, citing *Noble III v. Ailes*, 726 Phil. 296 (2015) [Per J. Perlas-Bernabe, First Division].

54 See CPRA, Canon VI, Section 33(b); See *also* footnote 159 of the CPRA.

55 A.C. No. 9114, October 6, 2020 [Per Curiam, *En Banc*].

56 835 Phil. 13 (2018) [Per Curiam, *En Banc*].

57 806 Phil. 774 (2017) [Per Curiam, *En Banc*].

58 839 Phil. 292 (2018) [Per Curiam, *En Banc*].

Let a copy of this Decision be furnished the Office of the Bar Confidant to be appended to the personal records of respondent Atty. Ariel D. Maglalang, the Integrated Bar of the Philippines, and the Office of the Court Administrator for circulation to all the courts.

SO ORDERED.

ALEXANDER G. GESMUNDO
Chief Justice

MARVIC M.V.F. LEONEN
Senior Associate Justice

ALFREDO BENJAMIN S. CAGUIOA
Associate Justice

RAMON PAUL L. HERNANDO
Associate Justice

AMY C. LAZARO-JAVIER
Associate Justice

On leave
HENRI JEAN PAUL B. INTING
Associate Justice

RODIL V. ZALAMEDA
Associate Justice

MARIO V. LOPEZ
Associate Justice

SAMUEL H. GAERLAN
Associate Justice

RICARDO R. ROSARIO
Associate Justice

JHOSEP Y. LOPEZ
Associate Justice

JAPAR B. DIMAAMPAO
Associate Justice

JOSE MIDAS P. MARQUEZ
Associate Justice

ANTONIO T. KHO, JR.
Associate Justice

MARIA FILOMENA D. SINGH
Associate Justice