

### Title:

\*\*Heirs of Francisca Medrano vs. Estanislao De Vera\*\*

### Facts:

This case revolves around a property dispute, initiated upon the intestate death of Flaviana De Gracia in 1980, leaving a 463-square meter parcel of land in Pangasinan. Flaviana's half-sisters, Hilaria Martin-Paguyo and Elena Martin-Alvarado, waived their hereditary rights to the land in favor of Francisca Medrano in 1982, recognizing her expenses for Flaviana's care. Medrano built a bungalow on the land the same year.

After the death of Hilaria and Elena, some of their children confirmed the waiver through Deeds of Confirmation. However, due to the refusal of other children to confirm this, Medrano filed a complaint for quieting of title, reconveyance, reformation of instrument, and/or partition with damages in 2001 against several of Hilaria's and Elena's children, including Pelagia M. Paguyo-Diaz and Estrellita Alvarado-Cordero. During the pendency of this litigation, a Deed of Renunciation of Rights was executed in favor of Estanislao De Vera by some defendants on March 23, 2002.

De Vera filed an Answer with Counterclaim in 2002, presenting himself as the real party-in-interest. The trial court admitted De Vera's Answer with Counterclaim and declared the named defendants in default. Medrano's team filed a Motion to Expunge De Vera's Answer and a Motion for Reconsideration, leading to conflicting orders by the trial court concerning De Vera's participation. Notably, De Vera's failure to file a pleading-in-intervention as directed by the trial court culminated in the trial court's decision favoring Medrano by default and ordering the cancellation of TCT No. 41860 in Medrano's favor.

De Vera sought reconsideration and, upon denial, informed the trial court of his intent to file a petition for certiorari and mandamus before the Court of Appeals (CA), ultimately leading to the CA's decision to remand the case for trial to allow De Vera to present his evidence.

### Issues:

1. Whether De Vera could participate in Civil Case No. U-7316 without filing a motion to intervene.
2. Whether De Vera is bound by the judgment against his transferors.
3. Whether the CA properly took cognizance of De Vera's Petition for Certiorari and Mandamus.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court affirmed the CA's decision, holding that the trial court gravely abused its discretion in refusing to allow De Vera to participate in the case and requiring him to file a motion to intervene. It considered De Vera not a stranger but a transferee pendente lite, whose interest was directly linked to the named defendants. The failure to allow De Vera to present his case was viewed as a denial of due process.

### Doctrine:

The interest of a transferee pendente lite is not independent of his transferors, and any proceeding or judgment against the transferors binds the transferee under the principles of res judicata. The trial court can allow the transferee to be joined as a defendant, ensuring due process is afforded to all parties involved.

### Class Notes:

- Transferee Pendente Lite: A person who acquires interest in the property under litigation during the pendency of the case. Their rights and interests are directly linked to the original party from whom they acquired the interest.
- Due Process in Civil Proceedings: Ensures all parties have the right to participate and present evidence in court. Failure to provide this can lead to the annulment of proceedings.
- Res Judicata: A matter adjudged; a thing judicially acted upon or decided; a thing or matter settled by judgment. Ensures finality and fairness in legal proceedings by preventing the same dispute from being relitigated.
- The significance of intervention and its procedural requirements under the Rules of Court.

### Historical Background:

This case underlines the intricate nature of property disputes in the Philippine legal system, showcasing the procedural intricacies and the paramount importance of due process in civil litigation. It exemplifies the challenges in the adjudication of rights transferred during litigation and underscores the evolving jurisprudential guidelines regarding transferees pendente lite in the context of Philippine property law.