Republic of the Philippines
Department of Finance
Securities and Exchange Commission
COMMISSION EN BANC

In The Matter of
PETITION FOR VOLUNTARY DISSOLUTION

SEC Case No. 02-11-338

QUINTEZA, INC.

Petitioner.

X--x

DECISION

For consideration is the *Petition for Voluntary Dissolution* ("Petition") under Section 119 of the Corporation Code (now Section 135 of the Revised Corporation Code) filed by Quinteza, Inc. ("Quinteza") on 21 February 2011.

FACTS

Quinteza is registered with the Commission under SEC Registration No. CS200704298, with principal office at 88 Luzon Drive, Ayala Alabang, Muntinlupa City. Its primary purpose per its Articles of Incorporation is "to provide Interior Architecture; Design Consultancy; Facilities Planning; Feasibility Studies; Space Planning; Project Management and General Contractor Services."

On 21 May 2010, Quinteza resolved by majority vote of its board of directors and the vote of its stockholders owning at least two-thirds (2/3) of the outstanding capital stock, to conclude its business operations and institute dissolution proceedings with the Commission. Hence, on 21 February 2011, Quinteza filed its petition for dissolution.

In its Order dated 21 February 2011, the Commission gave due course to the Petition and directed, among others, the publication and posting thereof for such period of time and in places as prescribed by Section 119 of the Corporation Code, to enable interested persons to file their objections thereto, and to be afforded the opportunity to be heard during the initial hearing set on 27 April 2011. Quinteza was also directed to notify all of its stockholders and creditors of the filing of the Petition, and to furnish the Commission proof of such notice(s). Quinteza filed with the Commission its Compliance dated 06 April 2011 on an even date.

On 27 April 2011, a hearing was held where the Commission directed Quinteza to submit copies of pertinent documents in the pending cases against it namely Dionisio Igloria vs. Quinteza, Inc. and Gembert Bragais, et. al. vs. Quinteza, Inc. Quinteza filed with the Commission its Manifestation and Compliance dated 09 May 2011 on an even date.

On 19 October 2011, a clarificatory hearing was held and attended by Quinteza's counsel and the creditors. On the same date, an Order was issued by the Commission directing Quinteza to file its position paper providing grounds for the grant of its Petition despite the existence of cases pending against it; to submit its updated Audited Financial Statements (AFS) stamped received by the Bureau of Internal Revenue (BIR) and file its opposition to the creditor's opposition.

On 02 November 2011, Dionisio A. Igloria, Jr., Ricky Ermac, Jonard Ermac, Jun Sandoval, Jojo Sandoval, and Gembert Bragais submitted their position paper as creditors, stating their monetary claims against Quinteza by virtue of the labor cases decided in their favor and praying that their claims be ordered to be paid first before any favorable action on the Petition.

On 14 November 2011, Quinteza complied with the submission of pertinent documents and likewise submitted its Reply to its creditors' position paper.

On 28 June 2013, a Motion to submit case for resolution with Manifestation of satisfaction of judgement was filed by Quinteza.

On 13 May 2014, another Motion to submit case for resolution with Manifestation of satisfaction of judgement was filed by Quinteza.

ISSUE

The issue is whether or not the *Petition* should be granted.

DISCUSSION

The Commission finds the instant case moot and academic.

Petitioner Quinteza's Certificate of Registration was revoked pursuant to the Order of Revocation of Certificate of Incorporation of Delinquent Corporation dated 08 March 2013 issued by the CRMD.[1] This is considered a supervening event that effectively rendered the Petition moot and academic

[1] Attached as Annex A

because there is no longer any justiciable controversy that is needed to be resolved. The well-settled rule is that courts will not determine a moot and academic question. "Where the issues have become moot and academic, there ceases to be any justiciable controversy, thus, rendering the resolution of the same of no practical value. Courts will decline jurisdiction over moot cases because there is no substantial relief to which petitioner will be entitled and which will anyway be negated by the dismissal of the petition. The court will therefore abstain from expressing its opinion in a case where no legal relief is needed or called for."[2] Therefore, dismissal of the instant petition is proper.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the instant petition is hereby DISMISSED for being moot and academic.

SO ORDERED.

Pasay City, Philippines; 29 October 2019

EMILIO B. AQUINO
Chairperson

EPHYRO LUIS B. AMATONG
Commissioner

JAVEY PAUL D. FRANCISCO
Commissioner

KELVIN LESTER K. LEE
Commissioner

KARLO S. BELLO
Commissioner

[2] Philippine Ports Authority vs. Coalition of PPA Officers & Employees, G.R. No. 203142 August 26, 2015