#### ### Title

\*\*Simon de la Cruz vs. The Capital Insurance & Surety Co., Inc., G.R. No. L-12176, 123 Phil. 1411 (1966)\*\*

#### ### Facts

- \*\*Step-by-Step Facts:\*\*
- 1. \*\*Insurance Policy:\*\* Eduardo de la Cruz, a mucker employed at Itogon-Suyoc Mines, Inc. in Baguio, held an accident insurance policy (No. ITO-BFA-170) issued by The Capital Insurance & Surety Co., Inc., effective from November 13, 1956, to November 12, 1957.
- 2. \*\*Boxing Contest:\*\* On January 1, 1957, during the New Year celebrations, Itogon-Suyoc Mines sponsored a boxing contest for general entertainment. Eduardo, a non-professional boxer, participated in a bout against another non-professional boxer of similar height, weight, and size.
- 3. \*\*Accidental Injury:\*\* During the bout, Eduardo slipped unintentionally, enabling his opponent to land a blow on the left back part of his head. This caused Eduardo to fall and hit his head on the ring ropes, resulting in severe cranial trauma.
- 4. \*\*Medical Treatment and Death:\*\* Eduardo was taken to Baguio General Hospital unconscious and died the next day. The reported cause of death was intracranial hemorrhage.
- 5. \*\*Claim:\*\* Simon de la Cruz, Eduardo's father and the beneficiary of the policy, filed a claim with the insurance company for indemnification of Eduardo's death.
- 6. \*\*Denial of Claim:\*\* The insurance company denied the claim, asserting that the death resulted from Eduardo's voluntary participation in the boxing match, which they argued was not an accident.

## \*\*Procedural Posture:\*\*

- 1. \*\*Trial Court:\*\* Simon de la Cruz filed a specific performance action in the Court of First Instance of Pangasinan (Civil Case No. U-265) against the insurer.
- \*\*Insurance Company's Defense: \*\* The insurer contended that Eduardo's death was due to voluntary participation in the boxing contest and thus was not covered as an accidental death.
- \*\*Decision:\*\* The trial court ruled in favor of Simon de la Cruz, ordering the insurance

company to indemnify him for Eduardo's death, pay for burial expenses, and attorney's fees.

2. \*\*Appeal:\*\* The insurance company appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of the Philippines, contending that Eduardo's death, caused during a voluntary activity, did not constitute an "accidental means" under the terms of the policy.

#### ### Issues

- 1. \*\*Accidental Death Coverage:\*\* Whether Eduardo de la Cruz's death during a boxing contest was caused by "accidental means" covered under the insurance policy.
- 2. \*\*Voluntary Participation:\*\* Whether the voluntary participation of Eduardo in the boxing contest excludes his death from being considered accidental.
- 3. \*\*Exclusions in Policy:\*\* Whether failure to list boxing in the policy exclusions implies coverage for such deaths.

### ### Court's Decision

\*\*Resolution of Each Issue:\*\*

- 1. \*\*Accidental Death Coverage:\*\*
- \*\*Supreme Court's Analysis:\*\* The Court interpreted the terms "accident" and "accidental" in their ordinary, common acceptation, meaning events happening by chance, unexpectedly, or unusually. The Court acknowledged a growing legal tendency to view "accident" and "accidental means" as synonymous.

# 2. \*\*Voluntary Participation:\*\*

- \*\*Supreme Court's Analysis:\*\* The phrase "accidental means" used in insurance policies was examined. The Court held that while Eduardo's participation in the boxing contest was voluntary, the injury sustained was not the natural or foreseeable result of this voluntary act. The injurious blow happened due to an unforeseen, independent event—Eduardo's slipping. Such unforeseen ensuing occurrences align with the definition of "accidental means."

# 3. \*\*Exclusions in Policy:\*\*

- \*\*Supreme Court's Analysis:\*\* The insurance policy did not include boxing in its list of explicitly excluded activities. The absence of boxing as an exclusion led the Court to infer that the insurer did not intend to exclude coverage for injuries or death resulting from boxing matches. Therefore, indemnification was justified under the policy terms.

#### \*\*Final Decision:\*\*

- The Supreme Court affirmed the trial court's decision, holding that Eduardo's death was by accidental means and thus entitled to policy benefits.
- The insurer was ordered to indemnify Simon de la Cruz, pay burial expenses, and cover attorney's fees.

## ### Doctrine

- 1. \*\*Accident and Accidental Means:\*\*
- The terms "accident" and "accidental means" should be evaluated in their common, ordinary usage. An event is accidental if it happens by chance, without intention, or is unforeseen.
- Even voluntary acts can result in accidental injuries if some unforeseen, independent incident causes the injury or death.

# 2. \*\*Policy Exclusions:\*\*

- Failure to explicitly exclude certain activities from policy coverage implies inclusion, thus obligating the insurer for claims arising from such activities.

## ### Class Notes

\*\*Key Elements and Concepts:\*\*

- 1. \*\*Accidental Death Insurance:\*\* Policies cover death or injury arising from "accidental means"—a term understood in its ordinary sense unless otherwise strictly defined in the policy.
- 2. \*\*Voluntary Acts:\*\* A voluntary act does not preclude coverage if the actual injury is due to an unforeseen, independent incident.
- 3. \*\*Construction of Terms:\*\*
- "Accident": An unexpected, unintended event.
- "Accidental Means": The unforeseen or unintended cause leading to an event.
- 4. \*\*Policy Interpretation:\*\* Ambiguities in insurance policies (especially around exclusions) are typically resolved in favor of coverage.

## \*\*Statutory Provisions:\*\*

- Review insurance contract laws emphasizing policyholder protection against ambiguous exclusions.

## ### Historical Background

## \*\*Context of the Case:\*\*

- The 1960s in the Philippines saw evolving legal interpretations in the insurance domain, especially around terms like "accident" and "accidental means."
- Judiciary increasingly leaned towards consumer protection, ensuring clearer definitions in insurance policies and resolving ambiguities in favor of insured parties.
- This case reflects judicial trends towards broader interpretations of accidental coverage, aligning with global tendencies in insurance law evolution.

The case of Simon de la Cruz vs. The Capital Insurance & Surety Co., Inc. serves as a landmark in understanding and interpreting accidental death coverage within insurance contracts in the Philippines.