

### Title:

**\*\*Carlos Gelano and Guillermina Mendoza de Gelano vs. Insular Sawmill, Inc. and The Honorable Court of Appeals\*\***

### Facts:

This case involves a series of transactions and obligations incurred by Carlos Gelano, with Guillermina Mendoza de Gelano indirectly involved, and Insular Sawmill, Inc. between 1947 and 1952. The series of transactions included cash advances for rent, credit purchases of lumber materials for repair and improvement of the Gelanos' residence, and a joint and several promissory note to renew loans from China Banking Corporation.

Insular Sawmill, Inc., a corporation with a limited lifespan ending on September 17, 1995, later amended to December 31, 1960, leased a property owned by Guillermina Mendoza de Gelano starting November 19, 1947. Carlos Gelano obtained cash advances totaling P25,950.00 from Insular Sawmill, Inc., of which P20,000.00 remained unpaid. Additionally, the Gelano couple made credit purchases of lumber from Insular Sawmill amounting to P1,120.46, with an outstanding balance of P946.46 after partial payments.

On July 14, 1952, to help the Gelanos renew previous loans, Insular Sawmill, Inc., through Joseph Tan Yoc Su, co-signed a promissory note with Carlos Gelano for P8,000.00, resulting in a debt of P9,106.00, including interests, which Carlos partially repaid, leaving an unsettled balance of P4,106.00.

Insular Sawmill, Inc. filed a complaint for collection against the Gelanos on May 29, 1959. During the proceedings, Insular Sawmill, Inc.'s corporate existence was shortened and eventually dissolved on December 31, 1960, a fact not immediately revealed in court. Both trial and appellate courts found in favor of Insular Sawmill, Inc., holding the Gelanos liable for the various amounts owed. The dissolution of Insular Sawmill, Inc. and subsequent legal actions became central to the Supreme Court review.

### Issues:

1. Whether a corporation, after its dissolution, can continue prosecuting or defending suits beyond the three-year winding-up period without having transferred its assets to a trustee or assignee.
2. Whether the court erred in holding the Gelanos liable for obligations contracted by Carlos Gelano, considering the transactions' benefit to the family and the conjugal partnership's liability.

### Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court affirmed the appellate court's decision with modifications. It ruled that Insular Sawmill, Inc. could continue with the lawsuit despite its dissolution, as its lawyer could be considered a trustee for the litigation's purposes, constituting substantial compliance with Section 78 of the Corporation Law. This allowed the prosecution of the case beyond the three-year period following the corporation's dissolution.

On the issue of the Gelanos' liability, the Court affirmed the appellate court's decision that the obligations incurred by Carlos Gelano were for the benefit of the family, thus holding the conjugal partnership liable. However, it corrected that the liability should not be termed "joint and several" but should be attributed solely to the conjugal partnership.

### Doctrine:

Under Philippine Corporation Law, a dissolved corporation can continue prosecuting or defending suits beyond the three-year wind-up period through a trustee, which can include the corporation's counsel involved in the litigation. Additionally, obligations contracted by one spouse that benefit the family can be charged against the conjugal partnership.

### Class Notes:

- A dissolved corporation has a three-year period to wind up its affairs but can extend its legal battles beyond this timeframe through a trustee, which may include its counsel.
- Obligations incurred by one spouse that benefit the conjugal partnership make the partnership liable for said obligations.
- The distinction between "joint and several" liability and conjugal partnership liability in the context of spouses' legal obligations.

### Historical Background:

This case sheds light on the nuances of corporate dissolution and the continuation of legal proceedings post-dissolution under Philippine law, reflecting the blend of American corporate principles with Filipino family law values. It underscores the legal system's flexibility in interpreting statutes to ensure justice and prevent parties from exploiting technicalities to enrich themselves unjustly.