

### Title:

Angeles v. Maglaya, G.R. No. 152905 (2006)

### Facts:

1. **Initial Petition:** On March 25, 1998, Aleli “Corazon” Angeles-Maglaya (Respondent) filed a petition for letters of administration and her appointment as administratrix for the intestate estate of her alleged father, Francisco M. Angeles, in the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Caloocan City.
2. **Petition Details:** The petition alleged that Francisco died intestate on January 21, 1998, leaving valuable properties. Respondent claimed to be Francisco’s legitimate child and stated that she, along with Belen Sagad Angeles (Petitioner), Francisco’s wife by his second marriage, were the surviving heirs.
3. **Petitioner’s Opposition:** Petitioner contested the claim, asserting she was Francisco’s lawful widow, having married him on August 7, 1948. She disputed respondent’s legitimacy, arguing that respondent did not provide proof of her parents’ marriage and that her birth certificate lacked Francisco’s signature.
4. **Trial:** Respondent presented testimonial and documentary evidence, including her birth certificate, photographs, marriage contract, and academic records to substantiate her claim. Respondent’s witnesses reaffirmed her claim of being Francisco’s daughter.
5. **Motion to Dismiss:** Petitioner moved to dismiss under Rule 16, arguing respondent’s failure to prove her legitimate filiation to Francisco. The RTC granted the motion and dismissed the petition due to lack of cause of action.
6. **Court of Appeals:** Respondent appealed. The Court of Appeals reversed the RTC’s decision on May 29, 2002, ordered the trial court to appoint respondent as administratrix, and treated the motion to dismiss as a demurrer to evidence.
7. **Supreme Court:** Petitioner sought review under Rule 45, focusing on errors alleged in the appellate court’s decision, particularly regarding respondent’s legitimacy.

### Issues:

1. **Legitimacy of Respondent:** Whether respondent is the legitimate child of Francisco M. Angeles and Genoveva Mercado.
2. **Treatment of the Motion to Dismiss:** Whether the Court of Appeals erred in treating the petitioner’s motion to dismiss as a demurrer to evidence.
3. **Appointment as Administratrix:** Whether the Court of Appeals erred in decreeing respondent’s appointment as administratrix of Francisco’s estate.

### Court’s Decision:

1. **Legitimacy of Respondent:**

- The Court ruled that respondent failed to prove legitimate filiation to Francisco. Article 164 of the Family Code stipulates children are legitimate if conceived or born within a lawful marriage. Respondent could not prove a valid marriage between Francisco and Genoveva.
- The birth certificate lacked the signatures of Francisco and Genoveva and was signed solely by the attending physician, which is insufficient for proving legitimacy.
- Other documentary evidence (marriage contract, school records, and photographs) did not meet the legal standards to demonstrate legitimate filiation.

2. **Treatment of the Motion to Dismiss:**

- The Supreme Court clarified that the motion to dismiss should have been treated as a demurrer to evidence under Rule 33, which implies the petitioner waived the right to present evidence if the motion is denied. However, in this case, the issue became moot as the determination of legitimacy was central and dispositive.

3. **Appointment of Administratrix:**

- Given that respondent was determined not to be a legitimate child, she was not considered an heir and thus not entitled to administer the estate. The law prefers the appointment of the surviving spouse, which in this case is the petitioner.

**### Doctrine:**

- **Legal Presumption of Legitimacy:** Article 164, Family Code, establishes that children conceived or born during a lawful marriage are legitimate. This presumption requires conclusive proofs like a marriage certificate or a series of admissible evidence showing a valid marriage.
- **Establishing Filiation:** According to Article 172, legitimate filiation can be established by the records of birth appearing in the civil register, final judgments, or admission in a public document or private instrument signed by the parent. In the absence of such forms, filiation can be shown through the open and continuous possession of the status of a legitimate child or by any means allowed by the Rules of Court.
- **Res Judicata (conclusiveness of judgment):** This principle precludes relitigation of issues already judicially determined in a final judgment.

**### Class Notes:**

- **Elements of Legitimate Filiation:** Conception or birth during a lawful marriage,

evidenced by official documents or continuous possession of status.

- **\*\*Demurrer to Evidence:\*\*** When a motion challenges the insufficiency of evidence after the plaintiff's case, and if accepted, waives the right to present final rebuttal.

**### Historical Background:**

This case encapsulates the legal challenges surrounding the legitimacy and proper administration of intestate estates in the Philippines. It emphasizes strict evidence requirements for proving legitimate filiation against competing heirs' claims, ensuring the rightful administration of estates according to lawful inheritance rights.

The pivotal decision highlights procedural nuances and the importance of conclusive proof in family law disputes, reflecting the judiciary's role in maintaining juridical consistency while mitigating fraudulent claims.