

### Title:

\*\*Herbert Brownell, Jr. vs. Macario Bautista and The Republic of the Philippines\*\*

### Facts:

In 1947, the Philippine Alien Property Administrator (Administrator) issued Vesting Order No. P-394, amending it in 1949, to vest himself with one-half undivided interest in several properties located in Baguio and Tarlac, Philippines. The vesting was predicated on the claim that Carlos Teraoka and Marie Dolores Teraoka, alleged Japanese nationals and enemies, owned the interests. The Administrator demanded from Macario Bautista, in possession of the properties and claiming sole ownership, the delivery of one-half of the said properties. Bautista refused, leading the Administrator to file a partition suit to obtain the properties.

During litigation, the Republic of the Philippines intervened, adopting the Administrator's complaint. Bautista defended his ownership by detailing the properties' inheritance path, disputing the Teraokas' enemy nationality, and challenging the Administrator's authority to vest properties not enemy-owned.

Subsequently, the case progressed to the Supreme Court on the premise that it involved purely legal questions, during which the Philippine Alien Property Administration was terminated, and its functions were transferred to the U.S. Attorney General, who was then substituted as the plaintiff.

### Issues:

1. Whether the Philippine Alien Property Administrator had authority after Philippine independence to invoke the Philippine Property Act of 1946 to enforce a vesting order.
2. Whether the action initiated by the Administrator falls under the jurisdiction of Philippine courts according to the Philippine Property Act of 1946.
3. The legality and validity of the vesting order issued by the Philippine Alien Property Administrator concerning the properties in question.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court held that:

1. The Philippine Alien Property Administrator (and subsequently the U.S. Attorney General) could invoke the Philippine Property Act of 1946 post-Philippine independence, given implied ratification by the Philippine government.
2. The action for partition initiated by the Administrator does not solely invoke recovery of

possession under the Philippine Property Act of 1946 but inherently questions the properties' ownership, thereby making it a matter for Philippine courts under Rule 71 of the Rules of Court.

3. The court did not err in assessing the nationality of Carlos and Marie Dolores Teraoka or in evaluating the vesting order's validity. It was determined that the vesting order was erroneously issued as it was based on incorrect nationality and ownership assumptions.

#### ### Doctrine:

This case reaffirmed the doctrine that Philippine courts have jurisdiction to review actions initiated by the Philippine Alien Property Administrator, even those attempted under the auspices of the Philippine Property Act of 1946, particularly when such actions inherently involve determination of property ownership and rights.

#### ### Class Notes:

- **Jurisdiction Over Foreign Claims:** Philippine courts can review cases involving foreign statutory enforcement actions (like those under the Philippine Property Act of 1946), especially when property ownership and rights are in question.
- **Authority of Alien Property Custodian:** The legitimacy of actions by the Alien Property Administrator (or similar authority) in vesting properties believed to be enemy-owned hinges on correct determinations of nationality and property ownership.
- **Partition Suit as Legal Strategy:** Even when seeking possession, initiating a partition suit involves a broader legal examination, including ownership rights, thus subjecting foreign vesting orders to local court jurisdiction and scrutiny.

#### ### Historical Background:

This case intersects with post-World War II geopolitical dynamics, specifically the management and recovery of properties believed to be owned by enemy nationals. The establishment of the Philippine Alien Property Administration and its subsequent activities underline the complex legal and administrative challenges in dealing with enemy properties, set against the backdrop of shifting sovereignties and emerging Philippine independence.