

TITLE OF THE CASE	DECISIONS OF THE SYSTEM OF ORIGIN AND THE COMMISSION	SC RULING
<p>1. GOVERNMENT SERVICE INSURANCE SYSTEM vs FE L. ESTEVES [Antonio Esteves, Sr. - deceased] (G.R. No. 182297, 21 June 2017)</p> <p>Date of Receipt by the ECC of Copy of Entry of Judgment: 25 March 2019</p> <p>Nature of Claim: Death Benefit Claim due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediate Cause - CVA, Hemorrhagic • Antecedent Cause - Hypertension, Stage III • Underlying Cause - NIDDM <p>Occupation of the Covered Member: Utility Worker at Gubat District Hospital, Sorsogon (Dec 1978 – Aug 2000)</p>	<p>Summary of the Case:</p> <p>On 05 Aug 2000 deceased member was rushed to the hospital due to body weakness, headache, and vomiting and died a few hours after, due to the ff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Immediate Cause - CVA, Hemorrhagic • Antecedent Cause - Hypertension, Stage III • Underlying Cause - NIDDM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The records are bereft of any evidence to establish that the conditions for compensability of CVA and <i>Hypertension</i> were complied with. • For CVA, the very first condition provided in Annex "A" of the Amended Rules, evidence must be presented to show a history of any trauma to the head at work. There was never any evidence of this. There being no evidence of trauma, the connection to the brain hemorrhage cannot be established. • As to his <i>Hypertension</i>, the ECC found that he did not have any history and that it caused impairment of the function of body organs like kidneys, heart, eyes, and brain. None of the medical reports had established the same.
	<p>DECISION OF GSIS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Antonio's underlying cause of death, <i>Non-Insulin Dependent Diabetes Mellitus</i>, is not considered as work-related. 	
	<p>DECISION OF ECC (20 April 2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deceased's <i>Stroke</i> was caused by his <i>Diabetes Mellitus</i>. • The deceased's underlying ailment, <i>Diabetes Mellitus</i>, is not work-connected but caused by genetic factors, obesity and overeating which are not related to the deceased's employment and working conditions. 	
	<p>DECISION OF THE CA (13 December 2007):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reversed the ruling of the ECC denying death benefits to respondent for the demise of her husband, stating that the respondent was able to present evidence to establish that the diagnosis that the deceased had <i>Diabetes Mellitus</i> was erroneous. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On CVA, "The death certificates and the affidavits of the various physicians who studied the medical records of the deceased sufficiently support petitioner's claim for death benefits. The numerous stressful tasks and physical activities that the deceased had to perform as a utility worker at GDH contributed to the development of his illness." 	
<p>2. GIOVANNI ASHLEY SAN GASPAR vs COURT OF APPEALS, GOVERNMENT SERVICE INSURANCE SYSTEM, AND EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION (G.R. No. 238228, 06 June 2018)</p> <p>Date of Receipt by the ECC of Copy of Entry of Judgment: 27 March 2019</p> <p>Nature of Claim: Disability Benefit Claim due to <i>Vitreous Hemorrhage of the Right Eye</i></p> <p>Occupation of the Covered Member: Assistant Statistician of DAR, Region IV-A, Laguna Provincial Office; Agrarian Reform Program Technologist</p>	<p>Summary of the Case:</p> <p>On 6 July 2012, while petitioner was working as a land surveyor, he experienced a sudden and piercing pain which caused blindness on his right eye. He was diagnosed to be suffering from <i>Vitreous Hemorrhage</i> of his right eye where a nerve ruptured causing bleeding and blindness. Thereupon, he underwent <i>Pars Plan Vitrectomy</i>.</p>	<p>Affirmation of the following Rulings of the CA (31 August 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appellant failed to demonstrate that his illness was caused by his employment and that the risk of contracting the disease was increased by his working condition. While the law requires only a reasonable work-connection and not a direct causal relation, petitioner proffered no telling proof that his ailment was really brought about by the nature of his work. His attribution to the working condition on the field deserves scant consideration. Petitioner's illness seemingly caused by ocular inspection and survey work is devoid of any medical underpinning.
	<p>DECISION OF GSIS (27 July 2015):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> His claim was denied because it was neither connected with his work nor did it increase the risk of contracting the same. 	
	<p>DECISION OF ECC (14 December 2015):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vitreous Hemorrhage in not included in the list of occupational diseases under the Amended Rules on Employees' Compensation; The appellant failed to provide substantial evidence showing that his working conditions as Assistant Statistician has caused the manifestation of the illness 	
<p>3. ANALYN A. LAYUGAN vs GOVERNMENT SERVICE INSURANCE SYSTEM [Corporal</p>	<p>Summary of the Case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 18 September 2006, Corporal Layugan figured in a fatal accident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affirmed the Rulings of the CA. The appellant, with the provisional representation of the PAO-SACS, filed a Motion for Extension of Time

<p>Ramon I. Layugan - deceased] (G.R. No. 233785, 05 March 2018)</p> <p>Date of Receipt by the ECC of Copy of Entry of Judgment: 27 March 2019</p> <p>Nature of Claim: Death Benefit due to multiple gun shot wounds</p> <p>Occupation of the Covered Member: Member of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (30 April 1993 – Sept 2006)</p>	<p>while in a military encounter with the NPA in Baggao, Cagayan, causing his death. His wife only filed a claim on 20 November 2014, eight (8) years from the date of the incident.</p>	<p>to File Petition for Review on Certiorari. Eventually, the PAO-SACS filed a Manifestation with Motion to Withdraw Appeal since it appears that the appellant is no longer interested in the instant case. Thus, the SC declared this case CLOSED and TERMINATED.</p>
	<p>DECISION OF GSIS (21 November 2014):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appellant's claim was denied by reason of the lapsed period of claiming benefits. 	
	<p>DECISION OF ECC (27 March 2015):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The EC claim was filed beyond the three-year prescriptive period under Article 201 of P.D. No. 626, as amended. 	
	<p>DECISION OF CA (22 May 2015):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On the appellant's contention that she is entitled to the benefits under P.D. No. 626, as amended, in view of the exceptions under the ECC Rules of Procedure, <i>having immediately filed her death benefits with the AFP</i>, the CA ruled that the benefits extended by the AFP and the ECC are manifestly different and remain separate. On the appellant's contention that the three (3) year prescriptive period under Art. 201 of P.D. No. 626, as amended, should be superseded by Art. 1144 of the Civil Code, the CA ruled that P.D. No. 626, as amended is a special law applicable to the prescriptive period for filing of claims by covered employees. Thus, it prevails over Art. 1144 of the NCC, a general law. (Generalia Specialibus Non Derogant) 	

<p>4. GOVERNMENT SERVICE INSURANCE SYSTEM vs SIMEON TAÑEDO, JR (G.R. No. 193500, 20 November 2017)</p> <p>Date of Receipt by the ECC of Copy of Entry of Judgment: 09 January 2019</p> <p>Nature of Claim: Disability Benefit due to <i>Varicosities</i></p> <p>Occupation of the Covered Member: Records Officer at the Bureau of Internal Revenue</p>	<p>Summary of the Case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Tañedo has been a public servant since 01 March 1976 and held the position of Records Officer before his retirement in December 2007. On 01 December 2003, he was examined at the National Kidney Institute where he was found to have <i>Varicosities</i> or <i>Varicose Veins</i> in his legs. Convinced that his ailment supervened by reason and in the course of his employment with the BIR, he filed a claim before the GSIS for compensation benefits under P.D. No. 626, as amended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SC reversed the CA Ruling and concurred with the ECC's evaluation that Mr. Tañedo suffered from a non-occupational disease and that he failed to prove the work-connection of his illness. Mr. Tañedo failed to provide substantial evidence to prove that his medical condition was caused by his work at the BIR. He was unable to present any competent medical history, records, or a physician's report that would objectively demonstrate that his claim has of a reasonable connection between his work and his medical ailment has substantial basis. All that can be found are (a) hospitalization claim for payment, and (b) the radiology consultation report that both merely describe his medical condition of "stasis dermatitis" or "superficial varicosities" but with no medical assessment as to the cause thereof.
	<p>DECISION OF GSIS (24 January 2004):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appellant's claim was denied on the ground that <i>Varicosities</i> is not considered an occupational disease under P.D. No. 626, as amended. 	
	<p>DECISION OF ECC (17 December 2007):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ECC affirmed the GSIS' denial of Mr. Tañedo's claim. It is required of the appellant to prove that the risk of contracting the said ailment was increased by the nature of his working conditions. However, looking the possible causes and the appellant's job as Records Officer, it appears that causal relationship between his illness and his job cannot not established. Medical science has already established that familial tendency is the most important predisposing factor in the development of varicose veins. 	

	<p>DECISION OF CA (15 April 2010):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CA reversed the Decision of the ECC. 	
<p>5. PERIOLA J. TABA vs SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM, PICOP RESOURCES, INC. [Bautista Taba – deceased] (UDK-16086, 21 March 2018)</p> <p>Date of Receipt by the ECC of Copy of Entry of Judgment: 13 February 2019</p> <p>Nature of Claim: Death Benefit due to <i>Cardio Pulmonary Arrest secondary to Post Cerebrovascular Accident Thrombosis.</i></p> <p>Occupation of the Covered Member: Paper Rigger at PICOP (Dec 1977 – Feb 1995)</p>	<p>Summary of the Case:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On 13 Nov 1995, the deceased member died due to <i>Cardio Pulmonary Arrest secondary to Post Cerebrovascular Accident Thrombosis.</i> As alleged by appellant, she filed for <i>EC Death Benefits before the SSS-Bislig Branch 18 Dec 1995.</i> 	<p>Affirmation of the following Rulings of the CA (28 February 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The petitioner filed a claim on <u>26 September 2003</u>, both for the injury sustained by her husband on 27 February 1988 and for his death on 13 November 1995, hence, petitioner’s cause of action has clearly prescribed, having filed her claim beyond the three-year period. On the compensability of deceased member’s CVA, the court ruled that, in order for a listed occupational disease and its resulting disability or death to be compensable, the conditions set forth under Annex “A” of the Amended Rules must first be satisfied. Hence, it is not sufficient for CVA to be listed as an occupational or work-related disease. The petitioner still has to prove, by substantial evidence, the causal relationship between her husband’s death and his working conditions in order for her claim to be compensable. In this case, however, petitioner failed to do so.
	<p>DECISION OF SSS-MOD (11 January 2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member’s death cannot be considered work-connected in the absence of documents proving that his death was due to the nature of his job. No employer-employee relationship at the time of his death considering that per computer records, the last contribution was February 1995. 	
	<p>DECISION OF ECC (23 May 2012):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The claim has prescribed pursuant to ECC Board Resolution No. 10-03-45 (<i>“Clarifying the Rules on Prescription under P.D. No. 626, as amended”</i>). Petitioner failed to show proof that the conditions for the compensability of CVA Thrombosis 	

	as provided in Board Resolution No. 11-05-13 were complied with.	
--	--	--