Extracting the Tiger's Tooth: *Metropolitan Manila Development Authority v. Garin*

Joseph Angelo D. Angel

50 ATENEO L.J. 129 (2005)

SUBJECT(S): CONSTITUTIONAL LAW
KEYWORD(S): LEGISLATIVE POWER

This is a Comment on the ruling of the Supreme Court in *Metropolitan Manila Development Authority v. Garin* which involves the delimitation of the MMDA's authority. The Comment first presents the factual antecedents of the case then it presents the issues involved. In its decision, the Supreme Court held that the MMDA had no grant of authority to enact ordinances and regulations for the general welfare of the inhabitants of the Metro Manila. Therefore, the confiscation of driver's license is an unauthorized exercise of police power.

The Author analyzes the Court decision by revisiting such doctrines as *MMDA v. Bel-Air*, where the Court declared that MMDA was created to put some order in the metropolitan transportation system but its powers are limited and does not extend to the broad definition of police power.

The Comment also discusses the development of the MMDA and its function as a special development authority. Its jurisdiction being limited to addressing the common problems involving basic services that transcends local boundaries. MMDA is not a local government unit or a public corporation endowed with legislative powers and therefore cannot enact ordinances. Although the legislature intended to give MMDA more teeth and make it stronger, its powers are in fact quite limited.

The Author concludes that the powers of MMDA are often controversial. In fact, the constant challenges of its legitimacy and authority has weakened its credibility as a development authority. The vision of the lawmakers as to its creation failed to meet expectations. It is recommended that rules involving the MMDA should be seen in their broad governmental context and assessed with reference to the full range of legitimating values.