

Republic of the Philippines Professional Regulation Commission Manila



PROFESSIONAL REGULATION COMMISSION RESOLUTION NO. 1234

Series of 2020

OF ALL COVERED PROFESSIONALS DURING THE ENHANCED COMMUNITY QUARANTINE PERIOD

WHEREAS, the Professional Regulation Commission (Commission) is mandated to perform any and all acts, enter into contracts, make such rules and regulations and issue such orders and other administrative issuances as may be necessary in the execution and implementation of its functions and the improvement of its services¹;

WHEREAS, due to the Corona Virus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, the President issued Proclamation No. 9922, (s.2020), declaring a State of Public Health Emergency Throughout the Philippines and Proclamation No. 929, (s.2020), declaring a State of Calamity Throughout the Philippines;

WHEREAS, the Executive Secretary issued a Memorandum dated 16 March 2020 on the guidelines in the imposition of the Enhanced Community Quarantine and Stringent Social Distancing Measures over the entirety of Luzon, including the National Capital Region (NCR), effective 12:00 AM of 17 March 2020 until 12:00 AM of 13 April 2020;

WHEREAS, Local Government Units in the Visayas and Mindanao regions have likewise imposed quarantine or lockdown measures within their respective jurisdictions, through the issuance of various Local Executive Orders²;

WHEREAS, while strict home quarantine is enjoined, the provision of security, health and emergency frontline and other critical services shall continue under skeletal work force. Amidst this health crisis, there is a need to mobilize all resources in order to augment the potential shortage in the supply of health and other professionals, especially in COVID-19 infected localities throughout the Philippines;

WHEREAS, there are professionals whose Professional Identification Cards (PICs) are to expire during the one (1) month enhanced community quarantine period but cannot update or renew the same because of the prevailing health emergency situation;

WHEREAS, as provided under the Professional Regulatory Laws (PRLs) of the various Professional Regulatory Boards, only those in possession of valid PICs in addition to their Certificate of Registrations (CORs) may lawfully practice these professions: Accountancy; Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering; Agriculture; Architecture; Chemical Engineering; Chemistry; Criminology; Customs Brokerage; Dentistry; Electrical Engineering; Electronics Engineering, Environmental Planning; Fisheries Technology; Forestry; Engineering; Geology; Guidance and Counseling; Interior Design; Landscape Architecture; Librarianship; Mechanical Engineering; Metallurgical Engineering; Midwifery; Naval Architecture; Nursing; Nutrition and Dietetics; Occupational Therapy, Optometry; Pharmacy; Psychology; Teaching; Radiologic Technology; Real Estate Service; Respiratory Therapy; Social Works, and Veterinary Medicine, while those in possession of CORs alone, may likewise lawfully practice the professions of: Aeronautical Engineering; Civil Engineering; Master Plumbing; Medical Technology; Medicine; Mining Engineering; Physical Therapy; and Sanitary Engineering;

¹ Section 7 (b), RA No. 8981 or the PRC Modernization Act of 2000

² Executive Orders No.025 for Kidapawan; No.17 for Koronadal; No.30 for Iligan; No.03-017 for Tacloban; No. 049 for Cagayan De Oro; No.055 for 055 for Iloilo; No.2020-09 for Zamboanga Del Sur; No.13-20 for Butuan; No.2020-36 for Tagum; and, No.10 for Davao, all series of 2020.

WHEREAS, the extension of the validity of the PICs is not expressly provided nor prohibited under the PRLs;

WHEREAS, it is a rule in statutory construction that what is not expressly or impliedly prohibited by law may be done, except when the act is contrary to morals, customs and public order. In other instances, the High Court has allowed or upheld actions that were not expressly prohibited by statutes when it determined that these acts were not contrary to morals, customs, and public order, or that upholding the same would lead to a more equitable solution to the controversy. Though there is no law governing the extension of the validity of the PICs, the act of allowing the same, given the circumstances obtaining, is deemed to be not contrary to morals, customs, and public order.

WHEREAS, the COVID-19 pandemic that is currently plaguing the country is a force majeure that could otherwise exempt professionals from securing the renewal of their PICs during such period;

WHEREAS, the country and our people need to recognize the heroic and indispensable services that professionals have been tirelessly providing as frontliners and responders during the Enhanced Community Quarantine.

WHEREAS, concerned Professional Regulatory Boards have expressed their full support to the Commission in extending the validity of the PICs in recognition of the professionals' devotion in performing their tasks as frontliners.

IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING, the Commission hereby RESOLVES to extend the validity of the PICs of all covered professionals, subject to the following rules and directives:

- 1. Only those professionals whose PICs shall expire during the quarantine period, including those with pending online applications for PIC renewal at such time, shall be covered by this issuance.
- 2. The extension shall only be until the lifting of the enhanced community quarantine.
- 3. No surcharge/penalty shall be imposed for the period corresponding the PIC extension herein granted.
- 4. After the lapse of the extension period, all covered professionals shall file their applications for PIC renewal within thirty (30) days therefrom, without any accruing surcharges/penalties.

This Resolution shall take effect immediately upon approval.

Done this 20th day of March 2020 in the City of Manila.

TEOFILO S. PILANDO, JR.

enre!

Chairman

Commissioner

ANDA D. REYES

JOSEY. CUETO, JR.

³ Knights of Rizal v. DMCI Homes, Inc, et. al, citing Manila Electric Company v Public Service Commission (658 Phil 661, 1934) and In the Matter of the Adoption of Stephanie Nathy Astroga Garcia (494 Phil 515, 2005); Summerville General Merchandising Co. v Court of Appeals (552 Phil 668, 2007)