

### Title:

**Jose Mendoza v. Philippine Air Lines, Inc., 90 Phil. 836 (1952)**

### Facts:

- Background of the Plaintiff:** In 1948, Jose Mendoza owned the Cita Theater in Naga, Camarines Sur, and usually showcased films there.
- Town Fiesta:** The Naga City fiesta on September 17 and 18, honoring the Virgin of Peña Francia, attracted large crowds from the Bicol region.
- Film Booking:** To capitalize on this event, Mendoza booked the film “Himala ng Birhen” (Miracle of the Virgin) from LVN Pictures, Inc. in Manila for exhibition during the fiesta.
- Preparations:** Mendoza printed 2,000 posters and advertised widely to ensure a large audience.
- Film Shipment:** On September 17, 1948, LVN Pictures consigned the film can to Philippine Air Lines (PAL) for air transport from Manila to Pili Air Port near Naga.
- Air Way Bill Issued:** PAL issued Air Way Bill No. 317133 for the shipment.
- Error in Delivery:** Although the film was loaded on PAL flight 113 and arrived in Pili, it was mistakenly not unloaded and returned to Manila.
- Efforts for Recovery:** Mendoza went to the Pili Air Port, where the station master could not explain the nondelivery, resulting in several urgent radiograms to Manila.
- Delayed Delivery:** The film was eventually located on September 18, and shipped again, arriving on September 20, but by then, the opportunity for the profitable exhibition had passed.
- Lawsuit Initiated:** Mendoza filed an action for damages against PAL, claiming lost profits due to the delayed delivery.
- Lower Court Decision:** The trial court acknowledged Mendoza’s loss of P3,000 due to PAL’s negligence but dismissed the complaint on the grounds of liability exclusions stated in the air way bill and lack of foresight.

### Issues:

- Contractual Liability of Common Carrier:**
  - Obligation to Deliver on Time:** Whether PAL was bound to deliver the shipment on a specified time despite the air way bill’s clause disavowing specific delivery times.
  - Negligence:** Whether PAL’s failure to deliver constituted negligence and if such negligence leads to liability for special damages.
- Application of Legal Codes:**

- **Civil Code vs. Code of Commerce**: Whether the case should be decided under the Civil Code or the Commercial Code.
- **Special vs. General Damages**: Whether special damages not foreseen or communicated at the time of contract could be claimed.

3. **Tort vs. Contract**:

- **Nature of the Suit**: Whether Mendoza's suit should be considered as a breach of contract or a tort (culpa aquiliana).

### Court's Decision:

1. **Contractual Obligation and Negligence**:

- The Court established that although the air way bill did not commit to a specific delivery date, once the shipment was accepted and loaded, PAL assumed the duty to deliver it to its destination.
- The trial court found PAL negligent for failing to unload and deliver the film timely. However, it ruled out fraud and established PAL as a debtor in good faith, per Article 1107 of the Civil Code, thus limiting its liability to foreseen damages.

2. **Legal Code Application**:

- The Supreme Court decided under the Civil Code, emphasizing foreseeability in damages.
- Even under the Code of Commerce, only ordinary general damages are provided for, not special damages unless foreseen or communicated.

3. **Special Damages**:

- Damages due to the missed exhibition were not foreseen by PAL as neither Mendoza nor LVN Pictures communicated the special circumstances and potential financial impact of the film's timely delivery.

4. **Tort vs. Contract**:

- The Court dismissed Mendoza's contention that the suit was a tort. It highlighted that his right to action stemmed from the contract of carriage, especially since he acted upon the air way bill to demand delivery, binding himself and PAL to the contract.

### Doctrine:

1. **Good Faith and Foreseeability**: A debtor in good faith is liable only for foreseeable damages at the time the obligation is constituted (Art. 1107, Civil Code).
2. **Special vs. Ordinary Damages**: In the absence of communication about special circumstances, carriers are not liable for potential special damages resulting from delays.

3. **Common Carriers' Liability**: Common carriers, including airlines, are liable for negligence but only within the bounds of foreseeable damages unless special conditions were communicated.

**Class Notes:**

1. **Carriers' Liability**:

- **Liability Limitation**: Carriers must expressly understand the special conditions to be liable for any special damages beyond ordinary delays (Art. 1107, Civil Code).
- **Contract Adherence**: Obligations defined in contracts of carriage involve duty to timely deliver, but liability for delays is limited unless special circumstances were communicated.

2. **Foreseeability in Damages**:

- **Debtor in Good Faith**: Liability is limited to damages foreseen at contract formation unless bad faith or specific forewarning pivots the liability scope.

3. **Commercial Transactions**:

- **Code of Commerce**: Applied to commercial transactions unless civil law prescribes otherwise.

**Historical Background:**

This case occurred in post-war Philippines, a period when the aviation industry was rapidly developing, and legal frameworks were evolving to encompass new forms of transportation. At this time, the intersection of traditional commercial law and innovative air transport required judicial clarification to establish applicable liabilities and foreseeability in commercial contracts. This decision laid foundational precedence for the treatment of air carriers as common carriers under Philippine law.