

xxx

xxx

xxx

Any amendment that will substantially affect the rights and obligations of the parties or materially change the contract shall go through the same review and approval process.” (underscoring and emphasis supplied)

- From the foregoing, marketing agreements are not required to go through the PARCCOM/DAR-SSO/PARC review and approval process.

DAR Opinion No. 04, s. 2005
February 10, 2005

JURISDICTION; CANCELLATION OF STOCK DISTRIBUTION OPTION (SDO) PLANS

- As to the first issue, since the SDO plan is **subject to the approval of the PARC** pursuant to Section 1(b), 2nd paragraph of DAR Administrative Order No. 10, Series of 1988, and since the Certificate of Compliance issued by the DAR Secretary may be **revoked for non-compliance with any of the requirements of Section 31 of R.A. No. 6657 (Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law)** pursuant to Section 12 of DAR Administrative Order No. 10, Series of 1988, and, considering furthermore that SDO Agreement cancellation is an **agrarian law implementation (ALI) case** strictly involving the administrative implementation of R.A. No. 6657 and other agrarian laws and guidelines, it is therefore the DAR Secretary, through and with the **recommendation/approval of the PARC**, who/which has jurisdiction on the matter.

DAR Opinion No. 03, s. 2004
February 03, 2004

JURISDICTION; APPROVING AUTHORITY OF THE OIC REGIONAL DIRECTOR

- Since there was **concurrence** by no less than the Secretary himself (who, within the DAR, has the power to resolve questions on jurisdiction of the approving authority) of the designation of ARDO Renato B. Alano as OIC for DAR Region I by way of Special Order No. 466, series of 2002 (**Designation of OIC for DAR Region I**), then it follows that the signing of the conversion orders (which was in keeping with the rationale of the issuance of Regional Special Order No. 95, Series of 2002 signed by Regional Director Wilfredo B. Leño, that is, “In the interest of the service and in order to ensure the smooth flow of operation in the region”) was in order and in accordance with Section 12.1 of DAR Administrative Order No. 01, series of 2002. There was, therefore, no want of jurisdiction as would warrant revocation of the conversion orders.

DAR Opinion No. 24, s. 2003
December 09, 2003