



Republic of the Philippines
Supreme Court
Manila

FROM THE CHAMBERS OF:

Teresita J. Leonardo-De Castro
ASSOCIATE JUSTICE

June 5, 2013

HON. MARIA LOURDES P. A. SERENO
Chief Justice
Supreme Court

**RE: G.R. NOS. 206844-45 COALITION OF ASSOCIATIONS OF
SENIOR CITIZENS IN THE PHILIPPINES, INC. (SENIOR
CITIZENS PARTY LIST) REPRESENTED BY FRANCISCO
G. DATOL vs. COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS**

**G.R. NO. 206982 COALITION OF ASSOCIATIONS OF
SENIOR CITIZENS IN THE PHILIPPINES, INC. (SENIOR
CITIZENS) REPRESENTED BY ITS PRESIDENT AND
INCUMBENT REPRESENTATIVE IN THE HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, ATTY. GODOFREDO V. ARQUIZA
vs. COMMISSION ON ELECTIONS**

Dear Chief Justice Sereno:

I wish to correct a misimpression in your letters dated June 5, 2013 that on May 28, 2013 at 8:05 a.m., what your office received from me was only the synopsis of the above-entitled cases. On the contrary, on May 28, 2013 at 8:05 a.m., I sent to you my covering letter dated May 27, 2013 which already stated my recommendation to only enjoin the implementation of the May 10, 2013 COMELEC Omnibus Resolution insofar as Coalition of Associations of Senior Citizens in the Philippines is concerned in SPP No. 12-157 (PLM) and SPP No. 12-191 (PLM). That letter was accompanied by the following:

- (a) the synopsis for the above-entitled cases;
- (b) the draft of my recommended TRO; and
- (c) the rollos for these consolidated cases.

As you are well aware, it is standard practice in the Court that a Member-in-Charge recommending the issuance of a TRO should already submit a draft of the same to the Office of the Chief Justice (OCJ) for approval upon making such a recommendation. This was precisely what was done on May 28, 2013 at 8:05 a.m. For your convenient reference, a photocopy of the complete set of documents received by your office on May 28, 2013 at 8:05 a.m. is enclosed herewith.

On May 28, 2013, after my May 27, 2013 letter together with its attachments had been delivered to your office, the Clerk of Court, Atty. Enriqueta E. Vidal, informed my office of the extremely urgent motions to reiterate the issuance of TRO and/or SQAQ filed in G.R. Nos. 206844-45. After verifying that you had not acted upon my draft, I sent to your office at 10:00 a.m. the **second version** of my draft TRO which added a "Whereas" clause narrating the filing of said motions. The substance of my recommended draft TRO remained the same. At that time, I also sent a revised synopsis. Please see enclosed a photocopy of the **second version** of my draft TRO and of the revised synopsis which your office received at 10:00 a.m. on May 28, 2013.

Subsequent to the submission of my second draft at 10:00 a.m. to the OCJ, the Office of the Clerk of Court forwarded to me the supplemental petition filed by petitioner in G.R. No. 206982. Again, after verifying that you **still** had not acted on my recommendation, I sent to your office at 1:30 p.m. the **third version** of my draft TRO this time modifying the "Whereas" clauses to include the filing of the supplemental petition. However, the substance of my draft TRO remained unchanged. Please see enclosed a photocopy of the **third version** of my draft TRO received by your office at 1:30 p.m.

I trust this will enlighten you on the real circumstances that occurred on May 28, 2013 while you were out of your office.

Very truly yours,

Teresito Leonardo de Castro
TERESITA J. LEONARDO-DE CASTRO

cc: Associate Justices
<with enclosures>