

5 Phil. 681

[ G.R. No. 2763. March 03, 1906 ]

**W. L. WEIGHT, PLAINTIFF AND APPELLEE, VS. ALFRED F. SMITH ET AL.,  
DEFENDANTS AND APPELLANTS.**

**D E C I S I O N**

**WILLARD, J.:**

This action was brought to recover on a promissory note dated June 20, 1904. The only claim presented by the appellant, the defendant below, is that the note was void because no revenue stamp was placed upon it, citing article 11 of the royal decree of May 29, 1894.

This contention has been decided adversely to the appellant in the case of *Rodriguez vs. Martinez*,<sup>[1]</sup> No. 1913, September 29, 1905.

The judgment of the court below is affirmed, with costs. After the expiration of twenty days let judgment be entered in accordance herewith and the case remanded to the lower court for execution. So ordered.

*Arellano, C. J., Torres, Mapa, Johnson, and Carson, JJ., concur.*

---

<sup>[1]</sup> Page 67, supra.

---