

The Jurisdiction of Courts Under the Judiciary Reorganization Act of 1980

Jacinto D. Jimenez

26 ATENEO L.J. 93 (1982)

*TAG(S): POLITICAL LAW, CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, JUDICIARY
REORGANIZATION ACT*

The constitutionality of the Judiciary Reorganization Act of 1980 has been many times questioned. In a particular case, for instance, its effect on the security of tenure of the incumbent judges has been criticized. Yet for the purpose of this Article, issues relating to such is set aside. In fact, the Article aims to examine the effects of such a law in the jurisdiction of the various courts.

The Article, in its discussion, enumerates the various courts, namely, the Intermediate Appellate Court, The Regional Trial Courts, The Metropolitan Trial Courts, Municipal Trial Courts and the Municipal Circuit Trial Courts. As regards the Intermediate Appellate Court, it highlights the said court's jurisdiction on special civil cases, annulment of lower courts' judgments and its appellate jurisdiction. In the case of Regional Trial Courts, the discussion is on three main areas, that of civil cases, criminal cases and others. The same approach is used in the analysis of the Metropolitan Trial Courts' jurisdiction.

Under the discussion on the jurisdiction of the aforementioned courts on civil cases, emphasis is given on such subjects that limit the jurisdiction of the courts, like issues concerning the whether or not the subject is incapable of pecuniary estimation and whether it involves real property, admiralty, sum of money or settlement of estates. Furthermore, discourse on delegated cases and special jurisdiction also appears.

The Author concludes with an idea he shares with other legal commentators, namely, that as with other new legislation, the Judiciary Reorganization Act is not devoid of flaws. Instead, he argues that it is sufficient that it is capable of meeting the demands of its times.