

# Heirs of Loreto C. Maramag vs. Eva Verna De Guzman Maramag, et al.

\*\*G.R. No. 182319\*\*

**## Facts:**

1. **\*\*Parties\*\***:

- Petitioners: Heirs of Loreto C. Maramag, represented by surviving spouse Vicenta Pangilinan Maramag.
- Respondents: Eva Verna De Guzman Maramag, Odessa De Guzman Maramag, Karl Brian De Guzman Maramag, Trisha Angelie Maramag, The Insular Life Assurance Company, Ltd., and Great Pacific Life Assurance Corporation.

2. **\*\*Context\*\***: Loreto C. Maramag had insurance policies with Insular Life Assurance Company and Great Pacific Life Assurance Corporation. Petitioners claimed to be legitimate heirs; respondents were alleged to be Loreto's illegitimate family.

3. **\*\*Claims by Petitioners\*\***:

- Loreto's alleged concubine, Eva, is disqualified from receiving insurance proceeds.
- Respondents' (Odessa, Karl Brian, Trisha Angelie) insurance entitlements are inofficious because they're illegitimate children.
- Petitioners are entitled to their legitimes first.

4. **\*\*Insurance Companies' Responses\*\***:

- **\*\*Insular Life\*\***: Admitted that Loreto misrepresented Eva as his legal wife and respondents as legitimate children. Insured disqualified Eva, designated policies' proceeds only to Odessa, Karl Brian, and Trisha Angelie.
- **\*\*Grepalife\*\***: Denied claims, alleging Loreto misrepresented his age rendering policies void. No law violation in designation as beneficiaries absent settlement of Loreto's estate.

5. **\*\*Proceedings in the Trial Court\*\***:

- Respondents (illegitimate family) did not file an answer; defaulted.
- Petitioners alleged the designation of beneficiaries was a donation subject to the Civil Code.
- RTC initially dismissed actions against respondents Odessa, Karl Brian, and Trisha Angelie.
- RTC dismissed remaining actions against Eva, Insular, and Grepalife upon their motions for reconsideration, as claims lacked legal basis.

6. **\*\*Court of Appeals (CA)\*\***:

- Dismissed petitioners' appeal due to a pure question of law, lacked jurisdiction.

**## Issues:**

1. Whether the lower courts erred by dismissing the complaint based on failure to state a cause of action using defenses not alleged in the complaint.
2. Whether the findings of the trial court improperly engaged in examination of facts not evidenced during trial.
3. The entitlement and distribution of the insurance proceeds among Loreto C. Maramag's legitimate and illegitimate families.

**## Court's Decision:**

The Supreme Court denied the petition for lack of merit and upheld the lower courts' decisions.

**### Analysis:**

1. **\*\*Criteria for Dismissal on Failure to State a Cause of Action\*\*:**

- A complaint must demonstrate a legal right, defendant's duty, and a breach of duty for it to survive a motion to dismiss.
- Courts typically review the sufficiency of the complaint based only on its allegations unless exceptions apply (e.g., judicial notice of facts).

2. **\*\*Insurance Code vs. Civil Code\*\*:**

- **\*\*Article 2011 of the Civil Code\*\*:** Insurance contracts are governed primarily by special laws (Insurance Code), not by Civil Code provisions on donations and successions unless there's a deficiency in the Insurance Code.
- **\*\*Section 53 of the Insurance Code\*\*:** Insurance proceeds go to the persons designated in the policy unless specified otherwise.

3. **\*\*Legitimes\*\*:**

- Legitimate heirs are not automatically entitled to insurance proceeds, which belong to designated beneficiaries under the Insurance Code unless named otherwise or disqualified.

4. **\*\*Implications of Beneficiary Designation and Disqualifications\*\*:**

- Eva disqualified from receiving proceeds either by insurers or by the insured's revocation is inconsequential. Designated illegitimate children can fully receive proceeds barring any legal prohibition.
- Petitioners, not being named beneficiaries, cannot claim proceeds.

5. **Jurisdiction**:

- Court of Appeals correctly dismissed the appeal citing jurisdictional grounds since the core issue involved a question of law.

**Final Ruling:**

The Supreme Court upheld the RTC and CA decisions, recognizing the primacy of the Insurance Code over Civil Code principles regarding the entitlement to insurance proceeds.

**Doctrine:**

1. **Insurance Proceeds**:

- Governed by the Insurance Code, primarily Section 53 of Insurance Code.  
- Designated beneficiaries are entitled to proceed unless specified otherwise.

2. **Legal Third Party Claims**:

- Cannot impose claims contrary to the contractual designations in insurance policies unless legally disqualified to receive proceeds.

3. **Effect of Civil Code Provisions**:

- Civil Code provisions on donations and succession do not apply to insurance proceeds absent stated deficiencies in the Insurance Code.

**Class Notes:**

1. Key Elements of a cause of action: Legal right, obligation of the defendant, breach of duty.

2. **Insurance Code**: Governs insurance contracts and entitlements to proceeds.

3. **Article 2011 of the Civil Code**: Special laws on insurance supersede general Civil Code laws.

4. **Section 53 of the Insurance Code**: Proceeds belong to named beneficiaries unless otherwise specified.

5. Court rules on the basis of the complaint's allegations, subject to specific judicial exceptions.

6. **Legal Heirs**: Claims to insurance proceeds are secondary to named beneficiaries.

**Historical Background:**

The case reflects ongoing complexities in Philippine insurance law where intersections between insurance policies, familial claims, succession laws, and the Insurance Code often require judicial clarification. The progression through various judicial levels underscores the vital role defining clear beneficiary designations to avoid post-mortem disputes.