

### Title: Sps. Belen v. Hon. Chavez et al.

### Facts:

The legal conflict commenced when private respondents, the Pacleb spouses, initiated an enforcement action for a foreign judgment from the Superior Court of the State of California, against petitioners, the Belen spouses, in the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Rosario, Batangas. The foreign judgment involved a default ruling ordering the Belens to pay the Paclebs a sum representing loan repayment, share in the profits, plus interest and costs. The procedure unfolded with complexities involving the service of summons, the participation of attorneys purportedly on behalf of the Belens, and the subsequent default proceedings leading to the RTC's decision favoring the Paclebs. Subsequent to various pleas, including a motion to quash a writ of execution and a notice of appeal, the petitions advanced through the judicial hierarchy up to the Supreme Court, primarily challenging the jurisdictional grounds and service processes.

### Issues:

1. Whether the RTC acquired jurisdiction over the Belens through the service of summons or the unauthorized appearance of an attorney.
2. Whether the service of the RTC's decision on the Belens was executed validly.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court granted the petition for review on certiorari, reversing the Court of Appeals' decision. It was concluded that:

- The RTC did not acquire jurisdiction over the Belens through the defective service of summons. The Belens were residents of California, U.S.A., rendering the service of summons in the Philippines ineffective.
- Despite attorney appearances purportedly representing the Belens without their explicit consent, some evidence indicated implied authorization for the attorney's appearance, sufficiently vesting the RTC with jurisdiction over their case.
- The service of the RTC decision was deemed improperly executed, as it was neither served to the lawyer of record at a valid address nor directly to the Belens. Consequently, the Supreme Court determined that the notice of appeal was timely filed within the reglementary period.

### Doctrine:

This case reaffirms the principles surrounding jurisdiction involving non-resident defendants in actions in personam, emphasizing that jurisdiction over the persons is crucial, which is

typically achieved through the proper service of summons. It also underscores the procedural requirements for the valid service of court decisions, ensuring the parties' right to due process.

**### Class Notes:**

- **\*\*Jurisdiction over Persons\*\***: In actions in personam against non-resident defendants, personal service of summons within the jurisdiction is required for the court to gain jurisdiction over their persons. If the defendant is abroad, alternative methods such as substituted service may be pursued with court approval.
- **\*\*Service of Court Decisions\*\***: Proper service of court decisions is significant to start the countdown to the appeal period. Service should be made to the counsel of record or directly to the party if the court orders so.
- **\*\*Role of Proper Representation\*\***: The appearance of counsel on behalf of parties implicitly or explicitly, particularly in international cases, is critical in determining the court's jurisdiction over the case.
- **\*\*Jurisprudential Doctrines\*\***: The distinctions between in personam, in rem, and quasi in rem actions dictate the applicable service of summons guidelines to ensure jurisdiction and uphold due process rights.

**### Historical Background:**

The case illustrates the intricate procedural and jurisdictional challenges involved in enforcing foreign judgments in the Philippines, especially concerning parties residing abroad. It highlights the evolving interpretation and application of legal standards for international litigation, encapsulating the balance between strict procedural adherence and the equitable administration of justice in the era of global interconnectedness.