



THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CONCILIATION PROCESS: A PRACTICAL WAY OF DELIVERING JUSTICE

Dr. Chona Pajarillo Agustin, Faculty Member and Thesis Adviser, College of Business, Entrepreneurship and Accountancy, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Charlene B. De La Cruz, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Gelby T. Medrano, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Renier L. Sinco, Student-Researcher, Bachelor of Science in Legal Management, Cagayan State University, Andrews Campus, Tuguegarao City, Cagayan, Philippines

Abstract: *This study investigated the effectiveness of Lupon Tagapamayapa in conciliation process as practical way of delivering justice in Barangay Caritan Centro in the city of Tuguegarao. Specifically, it determined the functions of Lupon Tagapamayapa, the different cases brought before them, how they administer conciliation, their efforts in reconciling parties, how effective they are in issuing certification to file action, enforcing laws and their proper application of the legal procedures. The descriptive-qualitative research was employed to measure the effectiveness of Barangay Caritan Centro and to determine the practicality of the Process concerning Katarungang Pambarangay Law. This research found out that the Lupon members are confident to discharge their exceptional efforts manifested by being conscious and discipline enough over their mandated roles, functions and responsibilities to make every conciliation proceedings successful through the observance of all the considered aspect of effectiveness. Moreover, the Lupon is readily available and accommodating in providing greater performing its responsibility in accordance with the existing provisions of the law ensuring that disputes must be compulsory and obligatory upon the parties subject to the conciliation process; that Lupon Tagapamayapa is effective to a great extent in acting judiciously in their duty to amicably settle disputes; policy of it to follow the legal protocols with utmost diligence as stipulated for under the Katarungang Pambarangay Law, Local Government Code of 1991, and other similar statutes. Lastly, the Lupon members are carefully executing the step-by-step process in accordance with their*



lawful mandate; exercises a deeper evaluation and investigation of the cases brought before them in order to qualify with their compulsory function to harmoniously settle conflicts. In the view of the findings of this undertaking, the researchers recommended that the Lupon Tagapamayapa be more effective in its current and future conciliation efforts over celebrated cases, it must come up with pro-active advocacies and milestone effort in identifying issues, projects, programs, activities, actions, concerns and problematic situations. Furthermore, they must exercise their legal mandate without prejudice to the speedy disposition of cases and proper administration of justice.

Keywords: *Lupon, Lupon Tagapamayapa, Punong barangay, conciliation, justice, respondents, certification of amicable settlement, arbitration, complaint, mediation, Lupon tagapagkasundo, repudiation*

INTRODUCTION

For many decades, the system of government in the Philippines had undergone many changes. Together with the change in the structure of government is the change in the system of justice. In the doctrine of inherent powers of state, where the three branches namely executive, legislative, and judicial, suggests that all be equal with each other. In this study, we will be dealing more of the judiciary. The judicial system in the Philippines includes a hierarchy of courts where only competent and proper judicial body can hear a case depending on its nature. Usually, pending cases takes months and/or years before it can be solved despite the fact that certain provision of the constitution states that there be speedy disposition of cases. Thus, during the Ferdinand Marcos administration, a law on compulsory conciliation was created under Presidential Decree 1508, in order that Filipinos, regardless of status or position, may avail justice without the burden of waiting for a long period of time. This special law created is also referred to as Katarungang Pambarangay (KP) or Barangay Justice System by which, the barangay being the smallest political subdivision in the Philippines can be an alternative, community-based mechanism for amicable settlement of disputes among and between members of the same community.

The scheme is a formalized Filipino tradition. It is the same old concept of our Filipino ancestors in seeking the help and advice of community elders or tribe leaders in resolving disputes between members of the same community. Even at those times that “barangay” is still the term for little communities datu and maharlikas uses this mode of amicable



settlement. This mode of settling conflicts is still practiced in Sha'ria Tradition on Muslim communities in the south and among Igorots and Itnegs of the north, where our indigenous, rich and peculiar customs, culture, dialects and traditions abound.

The judicial power extended to the Punong Barangay is mainly to promote a speedy disposition of cases; however, this power is also extended to the members of the Lupon Tagapamayapa for the observance of more judicious decisions. This system may improve the quality of justice in the country; it will decrease the number of indiscriminate filing of cases in courts and decongest the courts from numerous cases filed thereto.

On January 1,1992, the Revised Katarungang Pambarangay Law under Republic Act 7160, otherwise known as the Local Government Code of 1991 took effect repealing the former and introduced significant changes from authority granted to the Lupon up to the procedures to be observed in the settlement of disputes in the local barangays. Following the rules specifically provided in sec. 399 to sec. 422 of Republic Act 7160 also known as The Local Government Code Of 1991(accessfacility.org), there be no less than ten and not more than twenty members of the Lupon Tagapamayapa, possessing the qualifications and none of the disqualifications in order that he/she becomes a member. The term of the members is coterminous to that of the Punong Barangay, and subject for dismissal when he/she can no longer perform his duties and responsibilities as a member. The conciliation process includes not merely the settlement by reconciliation between parties; it starts with the mediation stage, where parties are assisted by the Punong Barangay, as the Lupon Chairman, to settle the dispute brought before him in the very first attempt being a mediator. If the mediation effort of the Punong Barangay has failed, the dispute will now be subjected to conciliation before the Pangkat Tagapagkasundo, which includes any three members of the Lupon Tagapamayapa acting as the conciliation panel thereby chosen by the parties, for further discourse towards arriving at an amicable settlement of their dispute. Disagreements may however also be settled through arbitration, it is when parties seek the assistance of a third party as an arbitrator where the two conflicting parties agrees that whatever the decision of the arbitrator shall be strictly abided by them.

The barangay justice system is a created for the possible enforcement of justice to every individual who seek relief from conflicts without the burden of costly application of cases in courts and securing the services of a lawyer. In the process of conciliation, the law prohibits



the participation of lawyers except in cases where he may be one of the parties. Because, even if justice is the primary subject matter of this system, the barangay justice cannot be considered as a court of justice nor a body or a part of the judicial branch of the government. It is formed for the purpose to provide friendly, low-cost, and fast medium for the settlement of disputes by agreement of the parties to abide with some terms and conditions arranged by and with them without resorting to the courts. This system of amicable settlement includes all cases unless otherwise provided in the law. To undergo conciliation proceedings must be deliberate, confidential, and personal; it is interest-based process. Having this procedure is a condition precedent in some cases which means courts will not entertain the suit filed if it yet not been undertaken with the Barangay Conciliation proceeding.

Filipinos are known to be fervent with history and culture. That even in this advance world we still carry these basic principles of ours from the customs we inherited from the past. Thus, customs and traditions are the most prevalent laws in the land. The phrase “barangay conciliation” already exists in the country even before the colonizers came unto the Philippine shores.

In 1979, the then president Ferdinand Marcos signed Presidential Decree 1508, also known as the Katarungang Pambarangay Law intended to guide the barangays in constituting a barangay justice system for amicable settlement of disputes. While it is not to introduce in the Philippines the practice of amicable settlement, we are amenable that this kind of system had long been used in the history and had always been part of the Filipino tradition (Pe, 1979). Prof. Cecilio Pe affirmed further that the barangay conciliation system has the vision to strengthen family relations, promote speedy trial, and quality enhancement of justice in the Philippines. Thus, a peace-making council was created with the brand: Lupon Tagapamayapa composed of the Barangay Captain as the Lupon Chairperson and not less than ten nor more than twenty members. Though considered as conciliation body, they cannot be reflected as a judicial tribunal or a court of justice because of the primary purpose it was created. It is only for the amicable settlement of disputes, it is that they are given authority to bring parties together, who are natural persons, residing in the same city or municipality. The Lupon shall not act as a whole body in the conciliation proceeding but only through a pangkat or a panel with three members from the Lupon. In the operation of the



Lupon, they may accept donations as funds and it will be unto their discretion if they will or will not collect fees in relation to the rendering of their service.

Gamboa (1980), had explained that a significant number of disputes are settled by making tacit accommodations required by the customs and traditions. Historians have noted the time-honored customs of bringing disputes to the barangay of tribal chief, of before some respected elder for amicable settlement of differences. Today, that custom of seeking mediation of conflicts, survives not only among the remote rural population but also in the small communities of the urban region. The official comment of the Technical Committee on PD 1508 (1979), states that in contrast of the concept of judicial neutrality and impartiality is not of such importance to the conciliation process. For unlike the judicial process, the hope for outcome of conciliation is not a judgment or decision imposed upon the parties but a settlement freely agreed upon by them.

As always discussed by Prof. Pe, it is conciliation, not adjudication. The Lupon is not a judicial tribunal, rather, a conciliation body. The authority is to bring parties together for peaceful and friendly settlement not to render judgment. With the initiation of oral or written complaint, the proceedings for conciliation may be immediately pursued. Complaint must be free, personal, and voluntary. With prior notice to the complainant and summons to the respondent or respondents of the date, time, and place for the meeting of the parties, the parties shall meet in the thereby specified details for the settlement of their conflict. If minors, or persons under the age of twenty one, and incompetents, which includes those that have illness, diseases, are unable, and people with unsound mind, there being involved in some cases and occasions, they may be assisted by their next of kin who are not lawyers. If the parties agreed to certain terms and conditions and abide with the result of the settlement, then it would be deemed successful; but if there be repudiation due to vitiated consent by fraud, violence, or intimidation, parties may go to the courts for relief instead.

Now, by virtue of Republic Act 7160, also known as The Local Government Code of 1991, Katarungang Pambarangay had been more effective in almost all of the Barangays due to the wider and better knowledge, but there are somehow people who still don't know these processes. Many people still do not understand that all cases, as a general rule, are subject to barangay conciliation before going to court. And what is the extent of the scope of the Katarungang Pambarangay and the Lupon Tagapamayapa? As provided in section 408 of The



Local Government Code of 1991 with the title '*Subject Matter for Amicable Settlement; Exception Thereto.*' That the Lupon Tagapamayapa of every barangay shall bear the authority to conduct assistance to the individuals or parties residing within the same city or municipality for amicable settlement, except in cases:

- (a) Where one party is the government, or any subdivision or instrumentality thereof;
- (b) Where one party is a public officer or employee, and the dispute relates to the performance of his official functions;
- (c) Offenses punishable by imprisonment exceeding one (1) year or a fine exceeding Five thousand pesos (P5,000.00);
- (d) Offenses where there is no private offended party;
- (e) Where the dispute involves real properties located in different cities or municipalities unless the parties thereto agree to submit their differences to amicable settlement by an appropriate lupon;
- (f) Disputes involving parties who actually reside in barangays of different cities or municipalities, except where such barangay units adjoin each other and the parties thereto agree to submit their differences to amicable settlement by an appropriate lupon;
- (g) Such other classes of disputes which the President may determine in the interest of Justice or upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Justice...xxx

In addition to this, Juridical persons are not also included (R. R. Robiso, 2014) because the law states that only natural persons may undergo conciliation. It is also interesting to note how Atty. Robiso emphasized the idea that the barangays are the smallest political subdivisions and smallest unit of government in the Philippines. It is small in area but so big that they are actually the nearest to the people making the easiest way to address the problems of the society. He further discussed that administration of justice is the given mandate to the barangays with the essential duty of conciliating both civil and criminal cases with the qualification that penalty on the case thereto is not more than a year or has a fine not exceeding five thousand pesos, before it may be filed before the court. Aside from the fundamental authority given to them there are many other special laws providing them some powers to be executed, these are:



The mandate of the R.A. 9262, Section 14 that the Punong Barangay is also granted the power to issue a Barangay Protection Order (BPO);

The establishment of Barangay Council for the Protection of Children under R.A. 9344 and creation of Barangay Agrarian Reform Committee under section 46 of R.A. 6657.

This system of administering justice in the barangay is considered a condition precedent (philjustfoundation.com), or a prerequisite to undergo conciliation proceedings before the same be filed in courts. Without the undertaking the conciliation process, while the case is immediately filed in the prosecutor's office or at any court, they may dismiss the case on the ground of prematurity by the latter.

In a separate discussion made by Dean Lope Feble, as comprehended in Section 410 Of The Local Government Code, "any individual who has a cause of action against another individual involving any matter within the authority of the Lupon may complain, orally or in writing, to the Lupon Chairman". The law is clear in its contention in emphasizing that the matter involved shall be between individual vs individual, while the word Individual means the natural person, not juridical like that of the corporation or partnership. Thus, when one party is a juridical person, the complaint may be filed directly to the court even without undergoing through barangay conciliation (Feble, 2014).

Similarly, Rule IV, Section 6 (b) of the Katarungang Pambarangay Rules: it is enough that disputants are just natural persons; the parties to a dispute must be residents of the same city or municipality to qualify. And cases carried unto the Lupon for conciliation must not be one amongst the excepted circumstances. Because as a rule, all cases: civil, criminal, administrative, labor, agrarian, and many others may be conciliated by the Lupon. Nature, value, and subject matter makes no difference at all for so long as Rule VI, Section 2 (c) of the Katarungang Pambarangay Rules as exemptions are observed.

The creation and composition of Lupon Tagapamayapa is mandatory to every barangay, and it is in the Punong Barangay that carries the burden of choosing the members who may compose the Lupon Tagapamayapa, in doing so, the Punong Barangay may consider the following guides as laid by Cecilio Pe and Alfredo Tadiar as the experts in Katarungang Pambarangay Law:



- (i) While following the rules, the Punong Barangay must choose the best; he may seek advice, suggestions, and recommendations of the Sangguniang Barangay so that he may establish a good list of potential members.
- (ii) The Lupon is a collective body, the success or failure of the panel is the reflection of Punong Barangay's acts. He, therefore, should never lose the vision of his duties and responsibilities especially that he is the one who chose the members of the Lupon.
- (iii) In the selection of members, politics must be set aside. If political aspect were the basis of selection, it may ruin the Lupon because the members shall view the disputes brought before them in their personal interest and understanding without consideration to essential purpose of their creation.

In this certain point, every individual, therefore, must be a participant in this advocacy to bring hope for progressive and problem-free community by carrying out the responsibility to make an upright living. That whenever there will be disputes and conflicts, for so long as the barangay justice system can settle them, then barangay conciliation should always be the first choice; besides, it is the only setting where all people can avail justice with all the means and limitations of the Lupon Tagapamayapa. There are some areas where access to court is next to impossible because of some factors, thus, the only way that they may resolve their disputes is to go through barangay conciliation. It is an offer not only for the speedy administration of justice but also for an inexpensive filing and hearing of cases, assuring that all is fair in justice.

It is therefore the duty of the Lupon to ensure that all disagreements brought before them shall be conciliated through suitable mediation or arbitration. Hence, this study seeks to measure the effectiveness of the Lupon Tagapamayapa in the administration of their duties as conciliators in the conflicts of their fellow community-members; and also to assess whether the existence of the Lupon is resolutely structured in accordance with the governing laws from the subject Lupon Tgapamayapa of Barangay Caritan Centro, Tuguegarao City from the given years, 2016 up to present. Because at times, the Lupon Tagapamayapa were challenged by many factors concerning their duty as mediator or conciliator in given dispute settlements.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study measured the effectiveness of conciliation process: a practical way of delivering justice in Barangay Caritan Centro. Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:



- 1) What is the composition and function of Lupon Tagapamayapa
- 2) What are the different cases brought before the Lupon Tagapamayapa
- 3) How the Lupon Tagapamayapa administers Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration
- 4) How effective the Lupon Tagapamayapa in terms of:
 - (i) Their conciliation effort to reconcile parties
 - (ii) Issuance of Certificate to File Action when conciliation is not successful
 - (iii) Enforcement of rules and governing laws
 - (iv) Proper application of the legal procedures for alternative dispute resolution

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Table 1.1. Effectiveness of the Lupon as self-assessed by its members

CONCILIATION EFFORTS TO RECONCILE PARTIES	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Read and understand the Katarungang Pambarangay Law	5	At all Times
2. Attend meetings and scheduled hearings	3.8	Most of the Time
3. Adheres to the Internal Rules of Procedures	4.2	Most of the Time
4. Accommodate persons with complaint and counter claims	4.9	At all Times
5. Interview and interrogate the client for the facts of the case	4.9	At all Times
6. Advise the person on the proper procedures to be done	4.9	At all Times
7. Drafted a written complaint and/or counter claim for filing	4.8	At all Times
8. Notify the complainant and summon the respondent	4.8	At all Times
9. Recommend the parties to reconcile under certain conditions	4.7	At all Times
10. Always aim for successful conciliation	4.8	At all Times
11. Provide other options to reconcile parties	4.6	At all Times
GRAND WEIGHTED MEAN	4.67	At all Times

Table 1.1 shows the **effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by its members particularly on their conciliation efforts**. It is observed on data that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed as effective **at all times** with the highest individual weighted mean at 5.00 particularly in



reading and understanding the Katarungang Pambarangay Law. The result shows that the members of the lupon tagapamaya had internalized the provisions of their mandate and understood the purpose of the special law therein provided. Moreover, the data reveal that respondents assessed the requirement of conciliation to be effective *most of the time* specifically on attending meetings and scheduled hearings garnering the lowest individual weighted mean on 3.8 which means that they actually appear physically during the course of the case but they are more often late or let other members thereof be present as a representative. The grand weighted mean of 4.67 shows that the members of the lupon tagapamayapa are at all times confident that they exert efforts to make every conciliation proceedings successful through the observance of all the considered aspect of effectiveness. The findings also imply that they are conscious and disciplined enough over their mandated roles, functions and responsibilities.

Table 1.2 Effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents

CONCILIATION EFFORTS TO RECONCILE PARTIES	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. The Lupon Members know their duties and responsibilities	4.5	At all Times
2. The Lupon Members attend schedule meetings and hearings	3.88	Most of the Time
3. Lupon Members explained the extent of power and process	4.25	At all Times
4. I was entertained with my complaint and/or counterclaim	4.38	At all Times
5. I was interviewed and interrogated for the fact of the case	4.13	Most of the Time
6. I am advised on the proper procedures to be done	4.5	At all Times
7. A Member drafted a written complaint and/or counter claim for filing	4.25	At all Times
8. I received a summon and/or notice of hearing	4.38	At all Times
9. A Member gave recommendations and necessary conditions	4.13	Most of the Time
10. The Members always aimed for successful conciliation	3.75	Most of the Time
11. The Lupon members provided options to reconcile parties	4.25	At all Times
GRAND WEIGHTED MEAN	4.21	At all Times



Table 1.2 shows the **effectiveness of the Lupon Tagapamayapa on conciliation efforts as assessed by the constituents**. It can be gleaned on data that the members of the Lupon is effective **at all times** particularly on: (a) their duties and responsibilities; (b) their advice on proper procedures being done or followed, having the highest individual weighted mean of 4.5 which indicates that the members are following the order of the law governing them in enlightening the public of the procedural processes of conciliation. Consequently, the data shows that respondent constituents measured the effectiveness of the Lupon in terms of their conciliation effort to reconcile parties as effective **most of the time** particularly on aiming for successful conciliation as illustrated by an individual weighted mean on 3.75 being the lowest considering that the members always aim for successful conciliation process and failure to do such is caused by different factors that contributes to the same. At times, the members are making efforts to reconcile parties but the parties themselves never had the interest to settle the conflict; the lupon assure that they always aim for a successful proceedings but one of the factors to be considered is the judicial jurisdiction that impedes them to pursue the same due to the limitations of power and authority laid by the governing statutes; it is to be noted that lack of merit is also an essential factor to be considered why some conciliation proceedings fail.

The entirety however, shows that the grand weighted mean of 4.21 means that the Lupon Tagapamaya is consciously discharging its functions while the continuously make more efforts in rendering excellent service to the people for a more sound and successful conciliation.

Table 2.1. Effectiveness of the Lupon as self-assessed by the Lupon members

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE TO FILE ACTION	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. The office of the Lupon Tagapamaya is accessible	4.5	At all Times
2. Issue Certificate to File Action when conciliation is not successful	4.5	At all Times
GRAND WEIGHTED MEAN	4.5	At all Times

Table 2.1 shows the **effectiveness of the Lupon as self-assessed by its members particularly on the issuance of certificate to file action**. It is perceived on data that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed to be effective **at all times** particularly on: (a) the accessibility of office; and (b) issuing certificate to file action specially when conciliation is not successful, as



shown by each individual mean and the grand weighted mean of 4.5. The positive result suggests that issuance of certificate to file action is a service not to be delayed but to be furnished in no time for a speedy disposition of conflicts resulting to a harmonious community. This finding means that the Lupon is readily available and accommodating in providing greater chances for the resolutions of the problem.

Table 2.2. Effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents

ISSUANCE OF CERTIFICATE TO FILE ACTION	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. The office of the Lupon Tagapamayapa is accessible	4.13	Most of the Time
2. Issue Certificate to file action when conciliation is not successful	3.75	Most of the Time
Grand Weighted Mean	3.94	Most of the Time

Table 2.2 shows **effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents**. It is shown that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed as effective **most of the time** specifically: on the accessibility of their office as shown by its individual weighted mean on 4.13. This finding means that the Lupon Tagapamayapa as accommodating as mandated to entertain the concerns of the constituents having conflicts. There is, however, a lower percentage in terms of issuing Certificate to file action when conciliation is not successful as shown by its individual weighted mean on 3.75 which is affected with various factors concerning the same. But the grand weighted mean of 3.94 suggests that the lupon tagapamayapa is effective at a great extent over the discharge of its functions.

Table 3.1. Effectiveness of the Lupon as self-assessed by the Lupon members

ENFORCEMENT OF RULES	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Strict implementation of conditions laid for reconciliation	4.5	At all Times
2. Acts fairly and justly in accordance with law	5	At all Times
Grand Weighted Mean	4.75	At all Times

Table 3.1 shows **effectiveness of the Lupon Tagapamayapa as self-assessed by its members particularly on the enforcement of rules**. The data shows that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed to be effective **at all times** both on: (a) the strict implementation of conditions laid for reconciliation process; and (b) acting fairly and justly in accordance with law, as shown by a grand weighted means on 4.75. The findings connotes that the members of the Lupon are performing their responsibility in accordance with given provisions of law.



Table 3.2. Effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents

ENFORCEMENT OF RULES	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. The Lupon Members strictly implemented the conditions laid for reconciliation	3.63	Most of the Time
2. The Lupon Members are fair and just	4.38	At all Times
GRAND WEIGHTED MEAN	4.00	Most of the Time

Table 3.2 shows **effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents on matters regarding the enforcement of rules**. The data shows that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed as effective **most of the time** mainly on: the strict implementation of the condition laid for reconciliation as shown by its individual weighted mean of 3.63. The finding means that conditions of settling disputes must be compulsory and obligatory upon the parties subject to the conciliation process.

On the other hand, the data also shows that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed as effective **at all times** with the individual weighted mean of 4.8 on being fair and just resulting to a grand weighted mean of 4.00 measured as effective **most of the time**. The data implies that the Lupon members are acting judiciously in their duty to amicably settle disputes.

Table 4.1. Effectiveness of the Lupon as self-assessed by Lupon members

PROPER APPLICATION OF THE LEGAL PROCEDURES	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. Accommodate persons with complaint and counter claims	4.9	At all Times
2. Interview and interrogate the client for the facts of the case	4.9	At all Times
3. Advise the person on the proper procedures to be done	4.9	At all Times
4. Draft a written complaint and/or counter claim for filing	4.8	At all Times
5. Notice the complainant and summon the respondent	4.8	At all Times
6. Issue Certificate to File Action when conciliation is not successful	4.5	At all Times
7. The Lupon Chair and any other member acted as an arbitrator, mediator, conciliator based on statutory provisions	4.9	At all Times
Grand Weighted Mean	4.81	At all Times



Table 4.1 shows **effectiveness of the Lupon as self-assessed by its members on the proper application of the legal procedure.** As observed on data, that the Lupon Tagapamayapa assessed as effective **at all times** exclusively to: (a) accommodate persons with complaint and counter claims; (b) interview and interrogate the client for the facts of the case; (c) advise the person on the proper procedures to be done; (d) act as an arbitrator, mediator, conciliator based on statutory provisions; (e) draft a written complaint and/or counter claim for filing; (f) notice the complainant and summon the respondent; and (g) issue Certificate to File Action when conciliation is not successful, as shown by common grand weighted mean on 4.81. The data suggests that the Lupon Tagapamayapa follows the legal methods of conciliation with utmost diligence in lined with the stipulations laid in the Katarungang Pambarangay Law, Local Government Code of 1991, and other similar statutes. However, it is also observed that issuance of certificate to file action has the lowest individual weighted mean at 4.5 which implies that the lupon do not issue the pertinent document immediately to give the subjects of conciliation essential time to think over the conditions of conciliation which is a vital procedure of the whole process.

Table 4.2. Effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents

PROPER APPLICATION OF THE LEGAL PROCEDURES	WEIGHTED MEAN	DESCRIPTION
1. I was interviewed and interrogated for the fact of the case	4.13	Most of the Time
2. I am advised on the proper procedures to be done	4.5	At all Times
3. Lupon Members drafted a written complaint and/or counter claim for filing	4.25	At all Times
4. I received a summon and/or notice of hearing	4.38	At all Times
5. The Lupon Member gave recommendations and necessary conditions	4.13	Most of the Time
6. Issued Certificate to file action when conciliation is not successful	3.75	Most of the Time
7. The Lupon Chair and any other member acted as an arbitrator, mediator, conciliator based on provisions of law	4.5	At all Times
GRAND WEIGHTED MEAN	4.23	At all times

Table 4.2 shows **effectiveness of the Lupon as assessed by the constituents on matters regarding the proper application of the legal procedures.** It is perceived on the data that the Lupon Tagapamayapa is assessed as effective **at all times** in particular: (a) in advising on



the proper procedures to be done; and (b) in acting as an arbitrator, mediator, conciliator based on provisions of law as shown by their individual weighted means on 4.5; and 4.5 respectively. These findings mean that Lupon members are carefully executing the step-by-step process in accordance with their lawful mandate.

Meanwhile, the data discloses that the Lupon Tagapamayapa as effective *most of the time* particularly: in the issuance of certificate to file action when conciliation is not successful, as shown by the lowest individual weighted mean on 3.75. Moreover, the finding implies that the lupon tagapamayapa is effective at all times as shown by the grand weighted mean of 4.23 which means that the Lupon exercises a deeper evaluation and investigation of the cases brought before them in order to qualify with their compulsory function to harmoniously settle conflicts.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

It is a general finding of this study that the Lupon members are confident to discharge their exceptional efforts manifested by being conscious and discipline enough over their mandated roles, functions and responsibilities to make every conciliation proceedings successful through the observance of all the considered aspect of effectiveness. Moreover, the Lupon is readily available and accommodating in providing greater performing its responsibility in accordance with the existing provisions of the law ensuring that disputes must be compulsory and obligatory upon the parties subject to the conciliation process. Likewise, it is general finding that Lupon Tagapamayapa is effective to a great extent in acting judiciously in their duty to amicably settle disputes. It is a policy of it to follow the legal protocols with utmost diligence as stipulated for under the Katarungang Pambarangay Law, Local Government Code of 1991, and other similar statutes. Lastly, the Lupon members are carefully executing the step-by-step process in accordance with their lawful mandate; exercises a deeper evaluation and investigation of the cases brought before them in order to qualify with their compulsory function to harmoniously settle conflicts.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data gathered from the survey questionnaire and the exclusive interview as a supplement and secondary source for the study, the researchers were able to generate the following conclusions.



1. The Lupon tagapamaya, though having excellently perform its duties and responsibilities has a low ratings on their issuance of certificate to file action due to the reasons that the lupon aims to make the conciliation process successful that they do not immediately give the pertinent document for the parties to have an ample time to think and decide over the matter in hopes that it be reconciled.
2. The Lupon Tagapamayapa performs its mandate in accordance to existing legal protocols of the law particularly the requirements of institutionalized conciliation processes.
3. It is a very imperative focus of the Lupon that disputes are amicably settle as it a way by which it saves both parties from court of law litigation that is more time consuming and relatively expensive.
4. Finally, it is a matter of policy to for Lupon to be procedural in the exercise of its powers and functions evaluation and investigation of cases of being brought before its jurisdiction purposely to lead it to a case of harmoniously settle conflicts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and conclusion drawn from the study, the researchers strongly recommend that the Lupon Tagapamayapa be more effective in its current and future conciliation efforts over celebrated cases, it must come up with pro-active advocacies and milestone effort in identifying issues, projects, programs, activities, actions, concerns and problematic situations. Furthermore, they must exercise their legal mandate without prejudice to the speedy disposition of cases and proper administration of justice.

Make the training more relevant to actual conditions and problems

REFERENCES

1. Annabelle T. Abaya, The Role of Mediation in Judicial Reform: The Philippine Experiences
2. Alfredo F. Tadiar, Research Study on Implementation of Katarungang Pambarangay Law. Ministry of Local Government, 1992. p. 55.
3. Antonio G.M. La Viña and Dennis M. Arroyo, The Public Verdict on the Performance of the Judiciary; SWS, 1993
4. Center for Legislative Development, Training Materials for the Seminar Workshop on Local Legislative Agenda Development Course, May 1999, Iloilo City



5. Development Academy of the Philippines, Terminal Report: Enhancing LGU Effectiveness in Policy Formulation and Local Legislation, March 2003.
6. Dihan, Reverendo. Handbook on Local Legislation, Revised Edition. Manila: MaryJoPublishing Inc. 1998.
7. Frequently Asked Questions on the Katarungang Pambarangay and the GRF- Barangay Justice Service System; Gerry Roxas Foundation
8. Fuller's, Collective Bargaining and the Arbitrator. Criminal Law and its Administration. Foundation Press, Inc. Mineola N.Y., 1980.
9. Gamboa, An Introduction to Philippine Law. National Book Store, 1980.
10. Hart and Sacks, The Legal Process: Basic Problem in the Making and Application of Law. Little Brown and Co., Boston & Toronto, 1981.
11. Local Government Development Foundation, Inc. A Simple Guide to the Codification of Ordinances, Training Materials for a Series of Local Legislation Specialist Courses.
12. Lope F. Feble and R. R. Riboso. <http://philjustfoundation.blogspot.com/p/plgr.html>, 2014.
13. National Anti-Poverty Commission and Department of Interior and Local Government, Guidebook on Poverty Diagnosis and Planning
14. Pe, Cecilio L. and Tadiar, Alfredo F. Guidebook for Lupon Tagapamayapa Members. VST Press, Manila Philippines, 1986. p. 1-4.
15. Philippines-Canada Local Government Support Program (LGSP) and Local Government Academy. How to Formulate an Executive-Legislative Agenda for Local Governance and Development, A Manual. 2004.
16. Philippines-Canada Local Government Support Program (LGSP) and Local Government Academy. How to Formulate an Executive-Legislative Agenda for Local Governance and Development, A Facilitator's Guide.2004.
17. Primer on the Barangay Justice Service System, Gerry Roxas Foundation.
18. Prof. Alfredo F. Tadiar. Katarungang Pambarangay: Compulsory Conciliation, Part II, 1979 edition, p. 152.
19. Prof. Cecilio L. Pe. Katarungang Pambarangay: Compulsory Conciliation, Part I,1979 edition, p. 3; p. 30-31; p. 46-47; p. 55; p99-100; p. 110-111; p. 118- 127.
20. Rules and Regulations Implementing the Local Government Code of 1991



21. Sylvia Sanz Ramos Rojo; The Barangay Justice System in the Philippines: Is it an Effective Alternative to Improve Access to Justice for Disadvantaged People?; 1992
22. Tadiar, Alfredo F. Research Study on Implementation of Katarungang Pambarangay Law. Ministry of Local Government, 1982.
23. The Local Government Code of 1991
24. The Revised Katarungang Pambarangay Law; Department of Justice.