\*\*Title:\*\* Manila Metal Container Corporation vs. Philippine National Bank and DMCI-Project Developers, Inc.: A Doctrine on Negotiation, Perfection, and Consummation of Contracts

## \*\*Facts:\*\*

Manila Metal Container Corporation (MMCC) owned a property in Mandaluyong, Metro Manila, secured by a mortgage for a loan from the Philippine National Bank (PNB). Following financial difficulties, PNB foreclosed on the property, selling it at a public auction where PNB was the highest bidder. MMCC sought to repurchase the property, initially requesting an extension for redemption and subsequently negotiating a price for repurchase with PNB.

Negotiations included several offers and counteroffers: MMCC proposed terms of repayment; PNB filed for extrajudicial foreclosure; MMCC requested an extension and later offered payments which PNB did not fully accept, proposing varying terms and rejecting MMCC's offers. MMCC eventually filed a complaint against PNB, arguing that a contract of sale had been perfected with their initial payment as proof of such an agreement. The Regional Trial Court (RTC) Pasig dismissed MMCC's amended complaint and PNB's counterclaim, while the Court of Appeals (CA) affirmed the RTC's decision, highlighting the absence of a meeting of minds on the price, thus no perfected contract of sale existed.

# \*\*Issues:\*\*

- 1. Whether MMCC and PNB had entered into a perfected contract for the petitioner to repurchase the property.
- 2. If the deposit made by MMCC can be considered as earnest money and constitute proof of a perfected contract of sale.
- 3. Whether the approval of the repurchase offer by PNB's Board was a suspensive condition that, once fulfilled, would result in a perfected contract.
- 4. Whether the negotiation responses, including counter-offers and rejections, between MMCC and PNB resulted in a legally binding contract.

## \*\*Court's Decision:\*\*

The Supreme Court upheld the Court of Appeals' decision, affirming that no perfected contract of sale existed between MMCC and PNB. Key points in the ruling were:

- A contract is a meeting of minds, and no contract exists without the concurrence of the offer, acceptance, and consideration. The Court found that MMCC and PNB did not have a meeting of the minds, particularly on the price of the property.

- The amount given as a deposit by MMCC was intended as a deposit towards repurchase and was not considered earnest money since it was made contingent upon PNB's Board approval, not as proof of a perfected contract.
- The Court clarified that the preliminary discussions and negotiations did not amount to a perfected contract as they did not culminate in a definitive agreement on essential terms including the price.
- The Court emphasized the importance of all essential elements of a contract being present for its perfection, reiterating that mere negotiations and preliminary agreements do not constitute a binding contract.

#### \*\*Doctrine:\*\*

- The doctrine established in this case highlights the stages of a contract: negotiation, perfection, and consummation, underscoring that a contract is only perfected when there is a meeting of the minds on the essential elements of the contract.

#### \*\*Class Notes:\*\*

- 1. \*\*Negotiation:\*\* The phase where parties discuss the terms of a potential contract.
- 2. \*\*Perfection of Contracts:\*\* Requires a meeting of minds upon the thing which is the object of the contract and upon the price.
- 3. \*\*Earnest Money:\*\* Serves as proof of the perfection of the contract and is considered part of the purchase price (\*Article 1482, New Civil Code\*).
- 4. \*\*Authority in Corporations:\*\* Contracts must be approved or authorized by the board or its duly authorized agents.

# \*\*Historical Background:\*\*

The case provides a nuanced view of commercial transactions and legal disputes arising from contractual agreements in the Philippines. It examines the complexities of corporate negotiations, the significance of board approvals in binding decisions, and the delineation between earnest money and deposits in contractual obligations.