

### Title:

**\*\*Spouses Antonio and Leticia Vega vs. Social Security System and Pilar Development Corporation\*\***

### Facts:

1. **\*\*Initial Situation\*\***: Magdalena V. Reyes (Reyes) owns a titled land in Pilar Village, Las Piñas City.
2. **\*\*Loan and Mortgage\*\***: On August 17, 1979, Reyes obtained a housing loan from the Social Security System (SSS), mortgaging her land.
3. **\*\*Sale Agreement\*\***: In late 1979, Reyes asked Antonio and Leticia Vega (the Vegas) to assume the loan and purchase her property as she planned to emigrate. The SSS did not formally approve the transfer but an employee advised that a private arrangement was permissible.
4. **\*\*Possession Transfer\*\***: December 1979, the Vegas paid Reyes P20,000 and took possession of the property in January 1981. Reyes left for abroad without executing a deed of assignment initially.
5. **\*\*Deed Execution\*\***: Between 1983-1984, Reyes' sister, Julieta Reyes Ofilada, executed the deed. The Vegas kept a copy but it was destroyed in a 1984 flood.
6. **\*\*Payment Issues\*\***: In 1992, the Vegas found out Reyes had not updated the amortizations and they subsequently paid P115,738.48 to the SSS to update it.
7. **\*\*PDC Lawsuit\*\***: On April 16, 1993, the Pilar Development Corporation (PDC), having acquired Reyes' debt from Apex Mortgage and Loans Corporation, filed a suit against Reyes, winning a money judgment for P46,398.00.
8. **\*\*Sheriff's Levy\*\***: Reyes' property was levied by the RTC Sheriff as part of the execution of the judgment.
9. **\*\*SSS Non-Response\*\***: The Vegas' request to recognize their subrogee status by the SSS went unanswered and the property was scheduled for auction.
10. **\*\*Vegas' Legal Actions\*\***: The Vegas filed various motions and interventions to stop the auction, but the RTC directed the execution to proceed and the SSS planned foreclosure.
11. **\*\*Consignation Action\*\***: The Vegas filed an action against SSS, PDC, RTC sheriff, and the Register of Deeds but the SSS later released the mortgage to PDC and TCT T-56657 was issued to PDC. The Vegas were evicted through a writ of possession.
12. **\*\*Trial Court Favor\*\***: On May 8, 2002, the RTC decided in favor of the Vegas, establishing their subrogation rights and ordering PDC to deliver title. SSS and PDC were held liable for damages.

### Issues:

1. **Proof of Sale**: Whether the Vegas presented adequate proof of Reyes' sale of the subject property to them.
2. **Validity of Sale**: Whether Reyes' sale of her SSS-mortgaged property to the Vegas was valid.
3. **Sheriff's Actions**: Whether the sheriff validly sold the property at public auction to satisfy Reyes' debt to PDC.

### ### Court's Decision:

1. **Proof of Sale**: The Supreme Court held that while the Vegas failed to present the original deed, secondary evidence due to loss without bad faith was permissible under Sec. 3 Rule 130 of the Rules of Court. The Vegas demonstrated sufficient corroboration of the sale, including possession and payment records.
2. **Validity of Sale**: The Court decided that Article 1237 of the Civil Code did not apply as Reyes consented to the Vegas assuming the mortgage debt. Furthermore, article 2129 provides that the mortgagee could seek payment from subsequent holders, preserving their right upon full repayment of the loan.
3. **Sheriff's Actions**: The Court found that PDC's claim was invalid as the property already changed ownership to the Vegas long before PDC acquired the judgment debt. According to Article 1625, the documented sale's validity was preserved by sufficient evidence of conveyance to the Vegas, who lived on the property for 13 years.

### ### Doctrine:

#### **Subrogation and Successor Liability**:

- Mortgaged property can be sold without the mortgagee's prior consent, but the buyer must honor the mortgage.
- Mortgage debts follow the property, providing the mortgagee options for collection from new holders.
- Article 1625's applicability is limited to incorporeal rights and is not absolute regarding property sales.
- Execution of third-party properties unconnected to the debtor is invalid.

### ### Class Notes:

#### **Key Elements**:

- **Subrogation (Art. 1236-1237, Civil Code)**: Allows a third party that pays a debtor's obligation to assume the debtor's rights against the creditor, provided there's consent.

- **Property Law (Art. 2129, Civil Code)**: Mortgage rights extend to anyone in legitimate possession of the property.
- **Execution on Judgment (Rule 39, RoC)**: Restricted to sole-owned properties of the judgment debtor.

**Relevant Citation**:

- **Rules of Court, Rule 130, Sec. 3**: Allows secondary evidence when original is lost/destroyed.
- **Civil Code Articles 1237 and 2129**: Address claims/subrogation and mortgage extension rights.

**Historical Background**:

In the 1970s and 1980s, as Filipino families sought to emigrate amidst political and economic instability, real estate transactions involving transferred debts and mortgage assumptions became prevalent. This case reflects the legal intricacies and risks of informal property agreements during that period and emphasizes judicial protection of rightful continuous ownership despite statutory technicalities or administrative lapses.