

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
Court of Tax Appeals
QUEZON CITY

Special Third Division

BANCLIFE INSURANCE CO., CTA CASE NO. 9939
INC.,

Petitioner, Members:
-versus- **RINGPIS-LIBAN**, *Chairperson, and*
 MODESTO-SAN PEDRO, JJ.

 Promulgated:
COMMISSIONER OF JAN 02 2024
INTERNAL REVENUE, 2:10 p.m.
Respondent. _____
X ----- X

RESOLUTION

MODESTO-SAN PEDRO, J.:

Before this Court is respondent’s Motion for Reconsideration (Re: Decision dated 05 October 2022) filed on 10 November 2022 (“Motion for Reconsideration”),¹ with petitioner’s Comment/Opposition (Re: Motion for Reconsideration dated 8 November 2022) filed on 9 January 2023 (“Comment”).²

In the Motion for Reconsideration, respondent alleges that:

1. This Court has no jurisdiction over the present case. The assessment against petitioner has already become final, executory and demandable;
2. The Court erred in ruling that petitioner was not properly served with the Preliminary Assessment Notice (“PAN”), Final Assessment Notice (“FAN”), and Formal Letter of Demand (“FLD”);
3. The Court erred in applying the ruling in the case of *Medicard Philippines, Inc. v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue* considering that it is not in all fours with the instant case; and

¹ Records, Vol. 2.
² *Ibid.*

4. The Court erred in ruling that the assessments are void because the revenue officer (“RO”) who conducted the audit/reinvestigation was allegedly not authorized with a Letter of Authority (“LOA”).

In the Comment, petitioner alleges that:

1. Respondent failed to raise any new and compelling arguments in his Motion for Reconsideration that have not been passed upon and considered by this Court;
2. The Court has jurisdiction over the present case as the deficiency tax assessments have never become final; and
3. In the absence of a new LOA, respondent’s ROs lacked the authority to conduct an investigation.

Following a studied review of the arguments, we **DENY** the Motion for Reconsideration for lack of merit.

In *Ortigas and Company Limited Partnership vs. Judge Tirso Velasco and Dolores V. Molina, and Dolores V. Molina vs. Hon. Presiding Judge, RTC, Quezon City, Br. 105, and Manila Banking Corporation*,³ the Supreme Court had the occasion to rule in this wise:

*“Effect, and Disposition of
Motion for Reconsideration*

The filing of a motion for reconsideration, authorized by Rule 52 of the Rules of Court, does not impose on the Court the obligation to deal individually and specifically with the grounds relied upon therefor, in much the same way that the Court does in its judgment or final order as regards the issues raised and submitted for decision. This would be a useless formality or ritual invariably involving merely a reiteration of the reasons already set forth in the judgment or final order for rejecting the arguments advanced by the movant; and it would be a needless act, too, with respect to issues raised for the first time, these being, as above stated, deemed waived because not asserted at the first opportunity. It suffices for the Court to deal generally and summarily with the motion for reconsideration, and merely state a legal ground for its denial (Sec. 14, ART. VIII, Constitution); *i.e.*, the motion contains merely a reiteration or rehash of arguments already submitted to and pronounced without merit by the Court in its judgment, or the basic issues have already been passed upon, or the motion discloses no substantial argument or cogent reason to warrant reconsideration or modification of the judgment or final order; or the arguments in the motion are too unsubstantial to require consideration, etc.”

³ G.R. Nos. 109645 and 112564, Resolution, 4 March 1996.

Moreover, in *H. Harry L. Roque, Jr., et al. v. Commission on Election, represented by Hon. Chairman Jose Melo, et al.*,⁴ the Supreme Court *En Banc* ruled that whenever the issues raised in the Motion for Reconsideration have already been addressed and passed upon in the Decision, and the Motion for Reconsideration failed to raise matters which are substantially plausible or compellingly persuasive, enough to lead the Court to rule in favor of the desired course of action, then the Motion for Reconsideration will be denied by the Court, to wit:

“Petitioners’ above contention, as well as the arguments, citations, and premises holding it together, is a rehash of their previous position articulated in their memorandum in support of their petition. They have been considered, squarely addressed, and found to be without merit in the Decision subject hereof. The Court is not inclined to embark on another extended discussion of the same issue again...

XXX XXX XXX

While a motion for reconsideration may tend to dwell on issues already resolved in the decision sought to be reconsidered—and this should not be an obstacle for a reconsideration—the hard reality is that petitioners have failed to raise matters substantially plausible or compellingly persuasive to warrant the desired course of action.

XXX XXX XXX

WHEREFORE, the instant separate motions for reconsideration of the main and intervening petitioners are DENIED.”

Likewise, in *Shangri-La International Hotel Management, Ltd., et al. v. Developers Group of Companies, Inc.*, it was provided that:⁵

“The bulk of the aforementioned grounds is a mere rehash of movant’s previous arguments. While DGCI is correct in stating that a motion for reconsideration, by its very nature, may tend to dwell on issues already resolved in the decision sought to be reconsidered and that this should not be an obstacle for a reconsideration, the hard reality is that movant has failed to raise matters substantially plausible or compellingly persuasive to warrant the desired course of action.

Considering that the grounds presently raised have been sufficiently considered, if not squarely addressed, in the subject Decision, it behooves movant to convince the Court that certain findings or conclusions in the Decision are contrary to law. As it is, however, the instant motion does not raise any new or substantial legitimate ground or reason to justify the reconsideration sought.”

⁴ G.R. No. 188456, Resolution, 10 February 2010


⁵ G.R. No. 159938, Resolution, 22 January 2007.

A perusal of the Motion for Reconsideration would show that the arguments raised therein have already been sufficiently passed upon, discussed, threshed out and judiciously resolved in the Decision, dated 5 October 2022, which is sought to be reconsidered. The Motion for Reconsideration discloses no cogent reason to disturb the findings and conclusions which this Court made in said Decision.

Applying the judicial pronouncements, above, nothing is left for this Court to do but to deny the same.

WHEREFORE, the instant Motion for Reconsideration (Re: Decision dated 05 October 2022) is hereby **DENIED** for lack of merit. ✓

SO ORDERED.


MARIA ROWENA MODESTO-SAN PEDRO
Associate Justice

I CONCUR:


MA. BELEN M. RINGPIS-LIBAN
Associate Justice