

### ### Title

**\*\*Dennis R. Manzanal & Baguio Country Club Corporation vs. Ramon K. Ilusorio\*\***

### ### Facts

On July 7, 1994, Ramon K. Ilusorio (respondent) was assigned a penthouse unit (PH-1) at the Baguio Country Club Corporation (BCCC) by Felix Adolfo B. Lopez, Jr., with the club's consent. For five years, Ilusorio and his business associates used the unit and club facilities without issue. In 1998, a family conflict arose, leading to restrictive actions by the club, including barring his access to the unit.

Ilusorio requested a statement of account from BCCC on May 31, 2001. The club initially billed him PHP 102,076.74, which he paid under protest. A detailed statement sent by Assistant Vice President Dennis R. Manzanal on November 26, 2001, itemized the total amount as PHP 2,928,223.26, citing Php 2,431,000 for guest room charges incurred by 97 sponsored guests and PHP 599,300 for unit rectification works.

BCCC's final demand letter on December 19, 2001, reiterated the unpaid charges and threatened enforcement under club rules. Ilusorio's reply on January 18, 2002, questioned Manzanal's authority and disputed the basis for the charges, claiming harassment and connection to his family feud.

Ilusorio filed a damages complaint against Manzanal and BCCC in 2002 before the Makati RTC, claiming no obligation to pay, asserting that the charges were baseless, prescribed, barred by laches and estoppel, and involved ongoing litigation regarding unit rectification. He sought injunction and moral damages of PHP 1,000,000.00 for the alleged bad faith and harassment.

### ### Issues

1. Did Ilusorio's complaint for damages state a cause of action against Manzanal and BCCC?
2. Were the actions of BCCC and Manzanal justifiable under Article 19 of the Civil Code related to abuse of rights?

### ### Court's Decision

The Supreme Court reversed the decision of the Court of Appeals, reinstating the RTC's order dismissing the complaint for lack of cause of action.

### **\*\*Issue 1: Cause of Action\*\***

The Supreme Court found that Ilusorio failed to establish a sufficient cause of action. A

cause of action arises from an act or omission that violates an individual's rights, entitling them to a remedy. The demand letters sent by Manzanal and BCCC followed standard practices for collecting dues from a member. The complaint did not sufficiently show how the claims were without legal basis or unreasonable.

#### **\*\*Issue 2: Abuse of Rights (Article 19)\*\***

While acknowledging Article 19 of the Civil Code, the Court emphasized that it establishes a general standard for ethical conduct and does not provide a direct remedy. The proper course would be actions under Articles 20 and 21, which were not invoked substantively here. The Court found that Ilusorio's failure to contradict BCCC's claims of dues from guest usage and the contracted usage terms implied an acknowledgment of the obligation.

#### **### Doctrine**

The case reiterates that actions for damages arising from alleged abuses in asserting contractual rights must show clear legal or factual bases for the claims. It reinforces the principle of standard ethical obligations under Article 19 and the necessity for maintaining consistency with Articles 20 and 21 when establishing an actionable wrong.

#### **### Class Notes**

- **\*\*Cause of Action:\*\*** Defined as the act or omission that violates another's right, requiring detailed factual allegations in the complaint.
- **\*\*Abuse of Rights (Article 19, Civil Code):\*\*** Requires adherence to standards of justice, fairness, and good faith. Claims must show how actions deviate from these principles.
- **\*\*Articles 20 & 21:\*\*** Provide remedies where rights are exercised in bad faith or cause harm, necessitating specific claims and evidences.

#### **### Historical Background**

This dispute emerged from the broader context of intra-family conflicts affecting membership privileges within exclusive organizations. The case showcases legal principles governing membership rights, obligations, and ethical conduct standards in contracting within private club settings. This highlights the judiciary's role in assessing claims of harassment and abuse within structured organizational rules and member engagements.