

Title: Chi Ming Tsoi v. Court of Appeals and Gina Lao-Tsoi

Facts: Gina Lao-Tsoi and Chi Ming Tsoi were married on May 22, 1988. Expecting a typical marital relationship inclusive of sexual intimacy, Gina was surprised when Chi Ming continuously neglected to consummate the marriage. They had no sexual intercourse from the first night and throughout their stay in Baguio City, which was intended as their honeymoon. After months of non-consummation, they sought medical examinations. Gina was found to be a virgin and healthy, whereas Chi Ming's results were not disclosed, and he was prescribed medication which he neglected to follow through. Gina perceived Chi Ming's behavior as indicative of impotence or homosexuality, speculating that their marriage was merely for maintaining his residency in the Philippines. Chi Ming insisted there was no defect on his part but claimed Gina refused his advances. The trial court declared their marriage void on the ground of psychological incapacity. Chi Ming appealed, but the Court of Appeals affirmed the trial court's decision. Chi Ming subsequently appealed to the Philippine Supreme Court.

Issues:

1. Whether the Court of Appeals erred in affirming the trial court's conclusion of non-cohabitation between the parties without independent factual findings.
2. Whether the refusal of Gina to engage in sexual intercourse with Chi Ming constitutes psychological incapacity.
3. Whether Chi Ming's allegations of Gina's refusal points to psychological incapacity on both parts.
4. Whether the allegations of collusion between the parties were appropriately addressed by the appellate court.

Court's Decision:

The Philippine Supreme Court found no merit in Chi Ming's petition. It held that the case was not a judgment on the pleadings, but a trial where testimonial evidence was presented and cross-examination allowed. The Court noted that since Chi Ming himself appealed the annulment, it demonstrated there was no collusion. Furthermore, the Court found that Chi Ming's behavior—his admitted reluctance to have sexual intercourse despite his capacity and no apparent resistance from Gina suggested a serious personality disorder that amounts to psychological incapacity. The Court recognized that an essential marital obligation is to procreate and that protracted refusal of sexual intimacy can be indicative of psychological incapacity. The Court agreed with the respondent court's finding that Chi Ming's explanation did not inspire belief and his indifference to determining the cause of the issue

weakened his case. Ultimately, the Supreme Court upheld the Court of Appeals' decision in declaring the marriage null and void due to psychological incapacity, with no collusion found between the parties.

**Doctrine:** The doctrine established in this case is that psychological incapacity does not necessarily refer to mental incapacity or psychosis, but it may involve a personality disorder that impedes the fulfillment of essential marital obligations, such as sexual intercourse for the purpose of procreation. In such cases, a marriage can be considered null and void under the Family Code of the Philippines.

**Historical Background:** The case exemplifies the Philippine Supreme Court's interpretation and application of Article 36 of the Family Code, which deals with annulment of marriage due to psychological incapacity. This provision was relatively new at the time, having been introduced in the Family Code in 1987 to supplant the Civil Code of the Philippines in relation to marriage. The decision illustrates the Court's evolving perspective on marital obligations and underscores a legal recognition of psychological factors that can affect marital relationships.