

### Title:

\*\*PCIB vs. Court of Appeals & Atlas Consolidated Mining & Development Corporation\*\*

### Facts:

Philippine Commercial International Bank (PCIB) and Manila Banking Corporation (MBC) jointly bid and successfully purchased assorted mining machinery and equipment from Philippine Iron Mines, Inc. (PIM) through a foreclosure sale on December 20, 1975. Four years later, on February 8, 1979, Atlas Consolidated Mining and Development Corporation (Atlas) entered into a Deed of Sale with PCIB and MBC to purchase some of these properties. The agreed upon sale price was initially P30 million, with a down payment of P12 million and the balance payable in six monthly installments. Provisions were made to adjust the total purchase price to exclude items retained by the Bureau of Mines, ensure the properties were free from liens and encumbrances, and clear Atlas from claims by the National Mines and Allied Workers Union (NAMAWU) related to a labor dispute with PIM.

Following an adjustment, the final purchase price was set at P29.63 million. However, when Atlas paid off NAMAWU's claim to avoid garnishment, a dispute arose over the amount due to NAMAWU and how it affected the total payments made by Atlas under its contract with PCIB and MBC. This led to contradictory claims between PCIB and Atlas on whether there had been underpayment or overpayment in settling the purchase price. The dispute escalated through various legal challenges, including a failed petition for certiorari by PCIB to the Philippine Supreme Court against the garnishment order, and finally culminated in Atlas seeking reimbursement for an alleged overpayment to PCIB.

The trial court ruled in favor of PCIB, ordering Atlas to pay the balance owing. Atlas appealed, and the Court of Appeals reversed the decision, ordering PCIB to reimburse Atlas. PCIB then filed a petition for review to the Supreme Court, which agreed to review the case based on the conflicting findings of the lower courts.

### Issues:

1. Whether PCIB should accept the P6.82 million it received as its share of the P12 million downpayment.
2. Whether Atlas should be fully credited for the P4.3 million it paid to NAMAWU.
3. The determination of whether Atlas overpaid or underpaid PCIB through its total payments.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court partially granted the petition. It agreed with the Court of Appeals that the P12 million downpayment issue became an internal issue between PCIB and MBC, absolving Atlas from any deficit as PCIB had initially accepted the amount received from MBC without contestation. On the NAMAWU payment, the Court reversed the appellate court, determining that Atlas could only recover—or offset against its obligations to PCIB—the amount that directly benefited PCIB, given the partial satisfaction of NAMAWU’s claim prior to Atlas’s payment. Therefore, the Supreme Court found that Atlas must pay PCIB P146,058.96, representing PCIB’s proportionate share of the actual amount due, with legal interest from the first demand on August 22, 1985.

### Doctrine:

This case reiterates principles surrounding joint obligations, particularly how payments should be applied when a third party makes a payment on behalf of debtors, with or without their consent, and how such payments are to be credited against the debtor’s obligations.

### Class Notes:

1. Joint Obligations: When multiple parties are involved, payments made by one debtor to the creditor must be credited according to any agreement or, in the absence thereof, equally among all debtors.
2. Payment by a Third Party: Under Article 1236 of the Civil Code, a third party who pays on behalf of a debtor may only recover from the debtor to the extent that the payment was beneficial to the debtor, especially if made without the debtor’s knowledge or against their will.
3. Overpayment and Reimbursement: A payer may seek reimbursement for overpayments but is limited to recovering only the amount that benefits the debtor, not exceeding the original debt owed.

### Historical Background:

This case highlights the complexities that can arise from transactions involving multiple parties and obligations, especially against a backdrop of collateral obligations such as labor claims against assets involved in sales transactions. It showcases the Philippine legal system’s approach to resolving disputes over payments and obligations when third parties act to protect their interests in the face of potential liens or encumbrances.