

### Title:

Anacleto vs. Van Twest and/or Euroceanic Rainbow Enterprises Philippines, Inc.: A Case of Compromise Agreement Voidability

### Facts:

Gloria A. Anacleto found herself embroiled in a dispute leading to the filing of a complaint for reconveyance of title against her and Isaias M. Bongar by Alexander Van Twest and Euroceanic Rainbow Enterprises Philippines, Inc. (Euroceanic) on February 6, 1995. The complaint, lodged by Atty. Ernesto V. Perez on behalf of Van Twest—who had been missing since June 16, 1992—alleged unauthorized representation through a general counsel/agent relationship. By March 31, 1995, both parties reached a compromise agreement facilitated by Atty. Diosdado M. Allado for Anacleto and Bongar, which outlined a payment schedule from Anacleto and Bongar to Van Twest totaling P4,800,000.00.

Following the trial court's approval of this agreement on April 6, 1995, discrepancies began to emerge concerning Atty. Perez's authority to represent Van Twest. Anacleto, via new counsel Atty. Marvin L. Herrera, sought to challenge the validity of this agreement, questioning Atty. Perez's lack of a Special Power of Attorney (SPA) from Van Twest, which was acknowledged by Perez but brushed aside by the trial court based on presumed estoppel due to prior knowledge of this fact by Anacleto's camp. Further legal maneuvers by Anacleto to vacate the judgment based on the compromise agreement were unsuccessful, resulting in the denial of her appeals for being late, propelling the dispute to the Court of Appeals and consequently to the Supreme Court via a petition for review on certiorari.

### Issues:

1. Whether a compromise agreement entered into by a lawyer without explicit authority from the represented party is valid.
2. Whether a party to a compromise agreement is estopped from questioning the agreement's validity if it was known the lawyer had no special authority.
3. The proper recourse for challenging a void compromise agreement and the consequent judgment based upon it.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court, in addressing the issues, unequivocally invalidated the compromise agreement citing lack of explicit authority and representation as necessitated under Article 1878 of the Civil Code and Rule 138, §23, rendering the agreement and judgment based upon it null and void. On the issue of estoppel, it determined that knowing in advance of the

lawyer's lack of SPA does not preclude a party from challenging the agreement, particularly when the assurance of authority was proffered by the lawyer himself. Furthermore, the Court clarified that void agreements can be impugned in any proceeding and do not require motions for annulment as with voidable agreements. Consequently, procedural lapses by Anacleto in appealing the trial court's decisions were eschewed in favor of equity, validating her petition for certiorari and nullifying the contentious agreement and judgment.

### ### Doctrine:

The case reaffirms the essentiality of explicit authorization for lawyers to enter into compromise agreements on behalf of their clients, as per Civil Code provisions and procedural rules. It also underscores the void nature of agreements entered without such authority, enabling such agreements to be challenged in any relevant proceeding.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Void vs. Voidable Contracts:** This case illustrates that contracts (including compromise agreements) entered without requisite authority are void ab initio, not merely voidable.
- **Essential Elements of Compromise Agreements:** Like any contract, compromise agreements require consent, object, and cause; lacking any, particularly explicit consent (authority), invalidates the agreement.
- **Authority of Attorneys:** Attorneys must have a special power of attorney to bind clients to a compromise agreement, as per Civil Code Art. 1878 and Rule 138, §23.

### ### Historical Background:

This case highlights the nuanced interpretation of legal representation and authority in the context of compromise agreements in Philippine jurisprudence. It emphasizes the judiciary's role in ensuring contracts' enforceability aligns with established legal standards and equitable considerations.