

Service Support Building (SSB), Administration Area, Lot 14, Phase 1-A, FPIP, Sto. Tomas, Batangas, Philippines
Tel No.: (043) 405 6388-89 / (043) 405 6407-08

MEMORAN	VDUM	NO.	HRADM
---------	------	-----	-------

TO

19 PK37563

NAME

Murillo, Manilyn Haca / m. haw

FROM

: PKIMT Management

SUBJECT

Written Warning

No. of Offense

1st Offense

This refers to the alleged offense(s) you have committed at

DATE

March 21, 2021

2/17/2021

to name:

PKIMT

No. Offense

Murillo, Manilyn Haca

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT FORM COMMENTS/ ASSESMENT

Violation Offense No.

V

OFFENSES AGAINST COMPANY INTEREST

Section No.

Omission or commission of an act in connection with or against the policies & procedures, SOPs, set work guidelines & to the particular duties and responsibilities inherent to the employee's work

Description:

Not following visual inspection rule

You are hereby given 5 days upon receipt of this letter to explain in writing why you should not be given a disciplinary action for such offense. Failure to comply would mean you voluntarily waive your right to due process and the company has no recourse but t implement the penalty provided for based in our company rules and regulations.

This is for your guidance and strict compliance.

NOTED BY:

PKIMT Management

Conforme:

FURUKAWA - Production Operator

(Please attach your written explanation upon returning of this letter)

I-ALERT WRITTEN EXPLANATION

FAS					Control No:	FAIP-1A-2102-944			
AGENCY	ecify: PKIN	n7		L. De Villa	K. Hernandez	O.Reyes			
Please Sp	ecny: / /////			Audited By:	Checked by:	Noted By:			
Name:	Murillo, MX	anilyn Process:		appearance		# " · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Position:	mociate	Group/Shift:		NC-A	Non-compliance Reference/Document				
ID Number:	1994375	03 Date/ Time:		Feb. 17, 2021 / 09:00	Control Number:				
Batch No.:	291	No. of Offen	se:	first oppense					
Batch No.: Car Model/Line:	ruzuki YC	Superior Na	me:	First offense B. Bipinity	PAIP- W	1- PRD-11-007			
Details of Audit Findings: Not Following Visual Inspection Rule Associate did not conduct poin to point system and not comparing actual horness to moster Comple dura hornesse inspection									
Accocia	te did no	t conduct poin to	2011	trychem and not	comparing actual	harness to mouter			
Cample during Appearance impactor WRITTEN EXPLANATION									
did od s	following a			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		allowed that			
The mint to point system and compare with the maker somether that is the little control									
00 - 100 base 100 bas									
wind pracedure because I need to squerze the over flow the hamen and having tampet									
par adu.									
REMARKS/ EVALUATION									
i-Alert written only Agency/FALP Written Only(based on handbook)									
Need day/s suspension(based from handbook & Memo for Major Non-compliance).									
	tt. 1			01	0.				
Cherry	1176	B. Eginin		P. Fabren	C HO	1			
Date: Employ	/ee)	Jr Staff Date: 2/2//2/		Staff	Supervisor	Manager			
Date.		Date: 2/24/2/		Date: 2/24/2/	Date: 24 2021	Date:			