

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF TAX APPEALS
QUEZON CITY

FIRST DIVISION

CTA CASE NO. SCA-0028

CITY OF LAS PIÑAS and
SUSAN M. BOMBITA City
Treasurer of Las Pinas City,
Petitioners,

- versus -

NOTICE OF RESOLUTION

REGIONAL TRIAL COURT OF
PASIG CITY, BRANCH 268, and
JOLLIBEE FOODS
CORPORATION,
Respondents.

To:

SUSAN M. BOMBITA
City Treasurer of City of Las Piñas
Office of the City Treasurer
Las Piñas City Hall Building
Las Piñas City 1740

OFFICE OF THE LEGAL SERVICES
City of Las Piñas
Thru: Atty. Leoville T. Ecarma
(Counsel for the Petitioners)
2nd Floor, City Hall Building
Las Pinas City 1740

SALVADOR LLANILLO & MIJARES
(Counsel for the Respondent Jollibee Foods Corporation)
Units 1706-1711, 17th Floor, Tower One & Exchange Plaza
Ayala Triangle, Ayala Avenue
1226 Makati City

HON. MARIA CHERYL B. LAQUI-CEGUERA
Presiding Judge
Thru: Atty. Nastasia Anne C. Padilla-Ongleo
Branch Clerk of Court
Regional Trial Court
National Capital Judicial Region
Branch 268 - Pasig City
Pasig City Hall of Justice, Caruncho Avenue
Brgy. San Nicolas, Pasig City

GREETINGS:

You are hereby notified by these presents that on **April 30, 2025**, a Resolution was rendered in the above-entitled case, copy of which is attached hereto.

Quezon City, Philippines, **May 5, 2025.**

Atty. Maria Johoanna F. Chan-Te
Executive Clerk of Court II

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
COURT OF TAX APPEALS
QUEZON CITY

FIRST DIVISION

CITY OF LAS PIÑAS, AND
SUSAN M. BOMBITA,

Petitioners,

- versus -

CTA SCA CASE NO. 0028

Members:

DEL ROSARIO, P.J., Chairperson,
BACORRO-VILLENA, and
CUI-DAVID, JJ.

REGIONAL TRIAL COURT OF
PASIG CITY, BRANCH 268,
AND JOLLIBEE FOODS
CORPORATION,

Promulgated:

Respondents.

APR 30 2025

3:50PM

X ----- X

RESOLUTION

On February 12, 2025, petitioners filed a **Motion to Withdraw Petition**, praying for the withdrawal of the Petition for *certiorari* and prohibition dated November 27, 2024. Petitioners manifest that public respondent Regional Trial Court of Pasig City, Branch 268 (RTC-Pasig City, Branch 268) issued an Order dated February 10, 2025, granting the Motion to Withdraw Complaint and Supplemental Complaint filed by plaintiff (herein private respondent Jollibee Foods Corporation) in Civil Case No. R-PSG-24-00217-CV. According to petitioners, the withdrawal of the Complaint and Supplemental Complaint and the subsequent termination of the case before the RTC-Pasig City, Branch 268, have rendered the legal issues raised and the reliefs sought in this Petition moot and academic.

A case becomes moot and academic when, due to supervening events, the conflicting issue which may be resolved by the court no longer exists.¹ In such case, the court would generally decline jurisdiction or dismiss it on the ground of mootness, as resolving the issue may no longer provide any practical value.²

¹ *Republic vs. Moldex Reality, Inc.*, G.R. No. 171041, February 10, 2016.

² *David vs. Macapagal-Arroyo*, G.R. No. 171396, May 3, 2006.

RESOLUTION

City of Las Piñas, and Susan M. Bombita vs. Regional Trial Court of Pasig City, Branch 268, and Jollibee Foods Corporation

CTA SCA Case No. 0028

Page 2 of 2

Resolving the issue of whether public respondent RTC-Pasig City, Branch 268 acted with grave abuse of discretion amounting to lack and/or in excess of jurisdiction in issuing the assailed Orders will no longer serve any legal or practical purpose in light of the termination of the case in the court *a quo*.

While jurisprudence has settled that courts may, in exceptional circumstances, assume jurisdiction and decide cases which have otherwise become moot and academic,³ none of the recognized exceptions are present in this case. Accordingly, the Petition may be deemed withdrawn on the ground of mootness.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, petitioners' **Motion to Withdraw Petition** is **GRANTED**. Accordingly, the Petition is hereby **DEEMED WITHDRAWN**, and the case is now considered **CLOSED** and **TERMINATED**.

SO ORDERED.


ROMAN G. DEL ROSARIO
Presiding Justice


JEAN MARIE A. BACORRO-VILLENA
Associate Justice


LANEE S. CUI-DAVID
Associate Justice

³ In *David vs. Macapagal-Arroyo*, G.R. No. 171396, May 3, 2006, the Supreme Court enumerated the following instances: (1) grave violation of the Constitution; (2) exceptional character of the situation and the paramount public interest involved; (3) when constitutional issue raised requires formulation of controlling principles to guide the bench, the bar and the public; and (4) the case is capable of repetition yet evading review.