

### Title:

Guerrero vs. Yñigo, G.R. No. L-1785, 96 Phil. 37 (1954)

### Facts:

Pedro Guerrero, the petitioner, entered into a legal dispute over a parcel of land in Nueva Ecija that was divided into two halves—east and west. The land originally belonged to Amando Catabona, who had mortgaged various portions of it multiple times to Serapion D. Yñigo and his wife Francisca D. Batañgan.

1. **Preceding Events:**

- March 2, 1944: Catabona mortgaged the entire land to Yñigo and his wife for P18,000, with a special clause giving them preferential rights to purchase the land.
- April 20, 1944: Another mortgage for P4,000 under similar preferential terms.
- July 11, 1944: A final mortgage for P5,000 was signed, using the term “mortgage with conditional sale,” creating ambiguity.
- August 4, 1944: Catabona sold the western half to Guerrero for P90,000. Guerrero was informed by Catabona about the existing mortgage but was assured that Yñigo would not mind provided his obligations were honored. Guerrero couldn’t immediately secure physical possession or registration reports due to delays in dealing with Yñigo.

2. **Procedural Posture:**

- Catabona continued to possess the land under the pretext of planting palay and later resisted transferring possession due to the devaluation of the Japanese war notes used for the sale.
- After subsequent failures to register their deed due to the unavailability of the owner’s copy of the Certificate of Title, Guerrero pursued legal remedy.
- November 16, 1946: Catabona sold the full parcel including the disputed western half to Yñigo for P6,000, who subsequently registered the deed, thus procuring Transfer Certificate of Title No. T-520 under his name.

### Issues:

1. **Main Legal Issues:**

- a. Whether the series of transactions entered between Catabona and Yñigo effectively mortgaged or sold the land permanently.
- b. Whether Guerrero’s purchase was legitimate given his knowledge of the existing mortgages.
- c. The enforceability of personal obligations regarding preferential purchase rights against

third-party purchasers.

### ### Court's Decision:

#### 1. **Resolution of Issues:**

##### a. **Nature of Instruments:**

- The Supreme Court ruled that the transactions between Catabona and Yñigo were indeed mortgages despite language suggesting a sale with pacto de retro, ruling out the legality of the clause for automatic title transfer upon default.

- This interpretation was crucial because had it been a sale with pacto de retro, title would have transferred immediately to Yñigo upon execution.

##### b. **Guerrero's Purchase and Good Faith:**

- The Court found Guerrero's purchase valid and in good faith. Despite knowing of the existing mortgage, Guerrero acted based on reassurances from Yñigo himself. The agreement that Yñigo's claim would be satisfied with the sale price further validated Guerrero's purchase.

##### c. **Binding Nature of Personal Obligations:**

- The mortgage and the clause regarding preferential purchase rights were personal obligations of Catabona and were not enforceable against Guerrero. Yñigo could only claim damages for breach of this personal contract against Catabona.

The Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeals' decision, reinstating the judgment of the Court of First Instance. Guerrero was declared the lawful owner of the western part of the land conditionally subject to settling remaining mortgage amounts.

### ### Doctrine:

#### 1. **Pactum Commissorium:**

- Provisions providing for automatic ownership transfer on default, commonly referred to as pactum commissorium, are unlawful and void under Philippine law.

##### - **Relevant Provisions:**

- Articles 1859 and 1884 of the Old Civil Code; Articles 2088 and 2137 of the New Civil Code.

### ### Class Notes:

#### #### Key Legal Elements:

#### 1. **Pacto de Retro Sale** vs. **Mortgage:**

- Distinguish between the two based on the immediate transfer of ownership versus using

the property as security.

- **Articles Referenced:**

- Article 1128, Old Civil Code; Article 1197, New Civil Code; Articles 1859 and 1884, Old Civil Code; Articles 2088 and 2137, New Civil Code.

2. **Personal Obligations vs. Real Rights:**

- Real rights, such as those registered in the land registry, hold against third parties while personal obligations between contracting parties do not.

**Simplified Guide:**

- **Pacto de Retro Sale vs. Mortgage:**

- Immediate ownership transfer vs. property used as collateral with a condition to repay.

- **Doctrine on Pactum Commissorium:**

- Any clause providing for automatic transfer of ownership upon default is void.

- **Good Faith Purchaser:**

- A purchaser in good faith is protected even if they were aware of certain encumbrances, provided assurances were given by the original mortgagor.

**Historical Background:**

This case occurs in the post-World War II Philippines transitioning from the severe economic disruption, particularly with transactions involving Japanese war notes, to stabilizing property rights and addressing disputes brought about by wartime economic chaos. It also highlights evolving jurisprudence around land transactions, mortgage laws, and interpretations of property ownership and good faith purchases within the vivid historical backdrop of the 1940s.