



Republic of the Philippines  
Supreme Court  
Office of the Court Administrator  
Manila

**OCA CIRCULAR NO. 58-2012**

**TO :** THE COURT OF APPEALS,  
SANDIGANBAYAN, COURT OF TAX  
APPEALS, REGIONAL TRIAL COURTS,  
SHARI'A DISTRICT COURTS,  
METROPOLITAN TRIAL COURTS,  
MUNICIPAL TRIAL COURTS IN CITIES,  
MUNICIPAL TRIAL COURTS, MUNICIPAL  
CIRCUIT TRIAL COURTS, SHARI'A CIRCUIT  
COURTS, THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF STATE  
PROSECUTOR, PUBLIC ATTORNEY'S  
OFFICE AND THE INTEGRATED BAR OF THE  
PHILIPPINES

**SUBJECT:** SUSPENSION FROM THE PRACTICE OF LAW  
FOR SIX (6) MONTHS OF ATTY. ROY PRULE  
EDIZA

For your information and guidance, quoted hereunder is the dispositive portion of the Decision of the Second Division dated 19 October 2011, in Administrative Case No. 5325, entitled "**Nemesio Floran and Caridad Floran vs. Atty. Roy Prule Ediza,**" to wit:

"**WHEREFORE**, we find respondent Atty. Roy Prule Ediza administratively liable for violating Rule 1.01 of Canon 1, Canon 15, and Rule 18.03 of Canon 18 of the Code of Professional Responsibility. He is hereby **SUSPENDED** from the practice of law for six months, effective upon receipt of this Decision. He is **DIRECTED** to return to the Spouses Nemesio and Caridad Floran the two (2) sets of documents that he misled the spouses and Sartiga Epal to sign. He is further **ORDERED** to pay Spouses Nemesio and Caridad Floran, within 30 days from receipt of this Decision, the amount of ₱125,463.38, with legal interest from 8 September 2000 until fully paid. He is warned that a repetition of the same or similar acts in the future shall be dealt with more severely."

In a Resolution dated 8 February 2012, the Court further **DENIED** the respondent's motion for reconsideration for lack of substantial merit.

04 July 2012

  
**JOSE MIDAS P. MARQUEZ**  
Court Administrator