

**Title:** United States of America et al. vs. Hon. V. M. Ruiz and Eligio de Guzman & Co., Inc.

**Facts**

- Background and Bidding Process:** In May 1972, the United States, operating a naval base in Subic, Zambales, invited bids for several repair projects related to typhoon damage and wharf maintenance. Eligio de Guzman & Co., Inc. (de Guzman) submitted bids in response.
- Telegram Confirmations:** The company received telegrams from the U.S. requesting confirmation of their price proposals and information on their bonding company. The company complied with these requests.
- Rejection of Bid:** In June 1972, the company received a rejection letter signed by William I. Collins, Director, Contracts Division, U.S. Navy, stating de Guzman's unsatisfactory performance rating on a previous project. Consequently, the projects were awarded to other parties.
- Filing of Civil Case No. 779-M:** De Guzman filed a lawsuit against the United States of America and individuals James E. Galloway, William I. Collins, and Robert Gohier from the U.S. Navy's Contracts Division. The complaint sought specific performance of the contract or, alternatively, damages if specific performance was not feasible, alongside a writ of preliminary injunction to prevent the defendants from contracting third parties for the projects.
- Special Appearance and Jurisdictional Challenge:** The defendants made a special appearance solely to challenge the jurisdiction of the court, arguing that the United States had not waived its sovereign immunity. They subsequently filed a motion to dismiss and opposed the issuance of the preliminary injunction.
- Trial Court Ruling:** The trial court denied the motion to dismiss and issued the preliminary injunction. The defendants filed motions for reconsideration, which were denied.
- Petition to the Supreme Court:** The defendants then petitioned the Supreme Court to restrain the trial court's proceedings permanently, citing a lack of jurisdiction given the principles of state immunity.

### ### **\*\*Issues\*\***

1. **\*\*State Immunity from Suit\*\***: Whether the trial court had jurisdiction over the case given the traditional rule of state immunity, which exempts a sovereign state from being sued without its consent.
2. **\*\*Commercial vs. Sovereign Functions\*\***: Whether the contracts for repair work constituted a governmental act (*jure imperii*) or a commercial act (*jure gestionis*), and if the latter, whether this implied a waiver of sovereign immunity.

### ### **\*\*Court's Decision\*\***

1. **\*\*State Immunity Applicability\*\***: The Supreme Court granted the petition, emphasizing the application of state immunity to acts *jure imperii* (governmental acts), not *jure gestionis* (commercial acts). It concluded that the contracts in question were integral to the naval base's operations, a sovereign function related to national defense.
2. **\*\*Misplaced Reliance on Lyons Case\*\***: The Court noted that the trial court's reliance on the Lyons case was erroneous. The statement on waiver of state immunity in Lyons was considered obiter dictum, not binding legal precedent.
3. **\*\*Nature of the Contracts\*\***: The Supreme Court reiterated that the contracts were inherent to the naval base's sovereign functions, dedicated to defense purposes rather than commercial activities. Thus, no waiver of immunity from suit was implied.

### ### **\*\*Doctrine\*\***

1. **\*\*Restrictive Doctrine of State Immunity\*\***: State immunity now generally extends only to sovereign and governmental acts (*jure imperii*) and not to private, commercial acts (*jure gestionis*). However, the correct application of this doctrine hinges on the nature of the act rather than merely the state's involvement in a contract.
2. **\*\*Commercial Transactions and Sovereign Immunity\*\***: Sovereign immunity does not apply to a state's commercial transactions unless the acts specifically pertain to its governmental functions.

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

- **\*\*State Immunity\*\***: A sovereign state is generally immune from litigation in foreign courts without its explicit consent, particularly for its sovereign acts.
- **\*\*Key Elements\*\***: Sovereign acts (*jure imperii*) vs. Commercial acts (*jure gestionis*).
- **\*\*Application Example\*\***: Defense-related contracts tied to sovereign functions (in this case, the U.S. Naval Base) are shielded under state immunity.

- **Case Citation**: Refer to Syquia vs. Lopez (84 Phil. 312) for precedent on distinguishing sovereign vs. commercial acts.

**Historical Background**

- **Post-War Agreements**: Post-World War II agreements like the Military Bases Agreement between the Philippines and the U.S. led to the establishment of U.S. bases in the Philippines, which played a significant role in regional defense strategies during the Cold War.
- **Development of International Law**: The case underscores the evolution of international law regarding sovereign immunity, reflecting the shift from absolute to restrictive immunity recognizing the multifaceted roles of modern states.