

- f. On March 29, 2023, at 8:30 in the morning, CENRO already denied calling me “magnanakaw” and even challenged me to file a case against him during the meeting with co-shippers. CENRO even instigated other shippers to sue me for discussing the irregularities in the loading inspection and area of loading.
 - g. Attached as ANNEX D in this complaint is the transcription of our phone call conversation being heard by my wife and son.
 - h. Such malicious imputations, insulting and abusive language demean my worth as a man doing merely a lawful business. Also, I was humiliated being called “magnanakaw” and “bakla” with all the intents to defame me. It likewise caused fear on the part of my family after hearing “*Wag ako*” “*Hindi mo ako kilala*”, and we experienced sleepless nights and anxiety. We have been being treated unfairly. *Was it because I did not comply to his demand through Mr. Tony Ungria to deliver in his favor wide Gmelina planks with 6ft. long for CENRO’s sofa and tables?*
 - i. What is more, CENRO Santos has been accusing me of harvesting and cutting Gmelina trees allegedly planted under the DENR’s National Greening Program (NGP), yet this remained unproven. He visited my log farm with his attempt to search for undocumented trees, but he found nothing. However, what is blatant and already right before his eyes violations of others are intently being ignored, just like the furniture shops keeping specie of Narra and Mulawin. He signs a transport permit even without the reporting of truck owner and driver, similar to what is being shown in this CTA marked as ANNEX E.
 - j. He became used to his habit of destroying my reputation before the officers of DENR-CENRO. Yet, I have planted more or less forty thousand 40,000 trees through hard work, gave people means of employment and source of livelihood especially during the pandemic, and helped the government in its drive to have a greener environment.
7. With all the above allegations of material facts, Respondent has clearly showed unprofessionalism and lack of respect for his office’s clients, in violation of the Code of Conduct and Ethical Standards for Public Officials and Employees (RA 6713). Thus, Respondent failed to uphold professionalism required of him as a public servant.
8. The Respondent failed to recognize that holding an esteemed position in the government is never a license to act capriciously with full freedom and liberty, therefore, he must be directed to conduct himself in a manner that is composed and befits a public official who