### Title: Herminio Tayag vs. Amancia Lacson et al.

## ### Facts:

This case pertains to a legal dispute involving the right to purchase agricultural land in Mabalacat, Pampanga, owned by Angelica Tiotuyco Vda. de Lacson, and her children (Amancia, Antonio, Juan, and Teodosia Lacson), and administered by Renato Espinosa. On March 17, 1996, a group of original farmers/tillers and another group comprising subtenants executed separate Deeds of Assignment in favor of Herminio Tayag, assigning their rights as tenants of the land for P50.00 per square meter, payable when legal impediments to the sale no longer existed, with the petitioner also given exclusive buying rights upon agreement to sell by the respondents.

The dispute arose when, on July 24, 1996, after partial payments were made by Tayag to the tenants, a meeting was called to implement the agreements which did not push through. By August 8, 1996, the tenants informed Tayag of their decision to sell their rights to the Lacsons instead, prompting Tayag to file a complaint with the RTC of San Fernando, Pampanga, to fix a payment period and for injunctive relief against the respondents and defendants-tenants. The respondents challenged the petition on various grounds, including the validity of the deeds under agrarian laws. The RTC initially sided with Tayag but, upon review by the CA, the decisions favoring Tayag were annulled, and the RTC was permanently enjoined from continuing the case. Tayag then appealed to the Supreme Court.

### ### Issues:

- 1. Whether the Deeds of Assignment executed by the defendants-tenants were contrary to public policy and agrarian laws.
- 2. Whether Tayag has a legal basis to enforce the Deeds of Assignment through a courtordered selling period and preliminary injunction.
- 3. Whether the CA erred in permanently enjoining the RTC from continuing with the civil case.

### ### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court partially granted Tayag's petition. It affirmed the CA's decision nullifying the RTC's orders as Tayag failed to establish a clear right to be protected, emphasizing that the tenants could not legally grant an exclusive right to buy the property they did not own. The Court disagreed with the CA's permanent injunction against the continuation of the civil case in the RTC, highlighting procedural impropriety.

## The Court found that:

- The Deeds of Assignment were not validly enforceable as they were premised on conditions contrary to agrarian laws, and the respondents were not parties to these deeds.
- Tayag failed to demonstrate a clear, unquestionable legal right necessary for the grant of a preliminary injunction.
- The action taken by the CA to permanently stop RTC proceedings was excessive and unwarranted at the stage of determining the propriety of a preliminary injunction.

#### ### Doctrine:

- For a preliminary injunction to be issued, there must be a clear and unmistakable right to be protected, a violation of that right, and an urgent necessity for the writ to prevent serious damage.
- Contracts or deeds assigning rights over agricultural lands that contravene agrarian reform laws are contrary to public policy and unenforceable.
- Appellate courts should refrain from prematurely terminating trial court proceedings through permanent injunctions, especially when the case's merits have yet to be fully adjudicated.

### ### Class Notes:

- A preliminary injunction requires a clear legal right, a violation of that right, and imminent and significant harm that the injunction would prevent.
- Agrarian reform laws protect tenants' rights and restrict their ability to assign or waive these rights to non-owners.
- The hierarchy of court procedures mandates that appellate courts should not halt ongoing trial court proceedings without a full examination of the case's substance.

# ### Historical Background:

The case underscores the tension between private contractual agreements and the protective intent of agrarian reform laws in the Philippines. It highlights the legal challenges in navigating property rights, tenant rights, and the limits of contractual freedom within the agrarian legal framework.