

592 Phil. 275

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. Nos. 166309-10, November 25, 2008]

**REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, REPRESENTED BY THE
COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS, PETITIONER, VS. UNIMEX
MICRO-ELECTRONICS GMBH, RESPONDENT.**

R E S O L U T I O N

CORONA, J.:

Parties must accept and respect the final and executory decision of this Court. They should know when enough is enough. They are not at liberty to continue filing clarificatory motions in disregard of a previous directive that no further pleadings would be entertained.

These cases were decided on March 9, 2007. The dispositive portion of the decision read:

WHEREFORE, the assailed decisions of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. SP Nos. 75359 and 75366 are hereby **AFFIRMED with MODIFICATION**. Petitioner Republic of the Philippines, represented by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs, upon payment of the necessary customs duties by respondent Unimex Micro-Electronics GmbH, is hereby ordered to pay respondent the value of the subject shipment in the amount of Euro 669,982.565. Petitioner's liability may be paid in Philippine currency, computed at the exchange rate prevailing at the time of actual payment.

SO ORDERED.

The decision became final and executory on August 2, 2007 and entry of judgment of the March 9, 2007 decision was made on November 7, 2007.

Upon motion of respondent Unimex Micro-Electronics GmbH, an elucidation of the March 9, 2007 decision was made in a resolution dated December 10, 2007 where the Court explained:

legal interest on the amount awarded at the rate of 6% per annum from September 5, 2001 up to the finality of the decision may be imposed and that,

thereafter, the legal interest shall be 12% per annum until the value of the shipment is fully paid.

The December 10, 2007 resolution also included a directive to the parties that no further pleadings would be entertained. Despite this, however, respondent filed another motion for further clarification on the manner of determining the reckoning point of the imposition of the 6% legal interest while petitioner Republic of the Philippines filed a motion for clarification of the resolution dated December 10, 2007 (to which motion respondent filed a comment/opposition).

In view of the resolution dated December 10, 2007 which ordered that no further pleadings would be entertained, the Court expunged respondent's motion for further clarification from the records and noted without action petitioner's motion for clarification in resolutions dated January 30, 2008 and April 16, 2008.

In total disregard of the foregoing, however, respondent filed yet another urgent motion for the immediate resolution of all [alleged] pending issues for clarification.

The motion is denied. No issue remains pending in this case. Likewise, no issue needs to be further clarified.

The expunction of respondent's motion for further clarification and the notation without action of petitioner's motion for clarification meant that the said motions were denied. Moreover, the Court has sufficiently and clearly explained the basis of its action in this case in its March 9, 2007 decision and December 10, 2007 resolution.

A statement of this Court that no further pleadings would be entertained is a declaration that the Court has already considered all issues presented by the parties and that it has adjudicated the case with finality. It is a directive to the parties to desist from filing any further pleadings or motions. Like all other orders of this Court, it must be strictly observed by the parties. It should not be circumvented by filing motions **ill-disguised as requests for clarification**.

WHEREFORE, the urgent motion for the "immediate resolution of all pending issues for clarification" is hereby **DENIED**. The parties, their respective counsels, agents or representatives are hereby **WARNED** not to file any further pleadings or motions in this case under pain of contempt.

SO ORDERED.

Puno, C.J., (Chairperson), Carpio, Azcuna, and Tinga, JJ., concur.*

* As replacement of Justice Teresita J. Leonardo-De Castro who is on official leave per Special Order No. 539.

Source: Supreme Court E-Library | Date created: November 21, 2013
This page was dynamically generated by the E-Library Content Management System