Title:

Hicoblino M. Catly (Deceased), substituted by Lourdes A. Catly vs. William Navarro, et al. and Ayala Land, Inc.

Facts:

- **September 6, 1993:** Respondents, represented by Atty. Hicoblino M. Catly, filed a Complaint against Las Piñas Ventures, Inc. for annulment of TCT No. T-5332 and recovery of possession with damages before the RTC, Branch 147, Makati City.
- **December 3, 1993:** Respondent ALI filed a Motion for Substitution and Motion to Dismiss citing jurisdictional issues, failure to state a cause of action, and prescription.
- **December 27, 1993:** Respondents motioned to file as pauper litigants and filed an Amended Complaint.
- **January 3, 1995:** RTC granted pauper litigant status to respondents.
- **March 4, 1996:** RTC denied ALI's motions, including the Motion to Strike the Amended Complaint.
- **June 17, 1996:** Respondent ALI filed a Petition for Certiorari with the CA; it was denied on September 27, 1996.
- **May 13, 1997:** A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) was executed between the parties, including a stipulation of attorney's fees worth P10,000,000.00 for Catly.
- **July 22, 1997:** RTC issued a Separate Judgment, directing ALI to release P20,000,000.00 as additional attorney's fees.
- **May 7, 2004:** Supreme Court in G.R. No. 127079 ordered the remand to trial court to determine the appropriateness of the P30,000,000.00 attorney's fees.
- **December 1, 2004 & December 13, 2004:** RTC, now presided by Judge Raul Bautista Villanueva, rendered Decisions, amending the awarded attorney's fees to P1,000,000.00.
- **March 1, 2005:** RTC denied Catly's motion for reconsideration.

Issues:

- 1. **Procedural Propriety:** Whether petitioner erred procedurally in filing the petition directly with the Supreme Court instead of the Court of Appeals.
- 2. **Merit of Attorney's Fees:** Whether the trial court acted within its authority in reducing the attorney's fees from P20,000,000.00 to P1,000,000.00.

Court's Decision:

Procedural Propriety:

- The Court deemed the direct recourse improper, highlighting the need for adherence to

the hierarchy of courts. Despite this misstep, the Court opted to exercise jurisdiction due to the broader interest of justice involved.

Merit of Attorney's Fees:

- The Supreme Court found the trial court's reduction of the attorney's fees to P1,000,000.00 from the agreed P20,000,000.00 unjustifiable without a thorough examination.
- Mandated the RTC to conduct a detailed hearing on the appropriateness of attorney's fees based on quantum meruit principles (time spent, complexity, results achieved, etc.).

Doctrine:

- **Quantum Meruit:** Courts are empowered to determine reasonable attorney's fees based on factors like time, effort, novelty, skill, and results, regardless of contractual stipulations if deemed unconscionable.

Class Notes:

Key Concepts:

- **Quantum Meruit:** Principles guide the jurisdiction's ability to assess and adjust attorney's fees.
- **Hierarchy of Courts:** Emphasizes the procedural requirement to initially seek redress from lower courts.
- **Compromise Agreements:** Binding once judicially approved, unless affected by vices of consent or other contractual faults.

Legal Provisions:

- **Article 2028, New Civil Code: ** Defines a compromise.
- **Section 24, Rule 138, Rules of Court:** Governs the allowance and control of attorney's fees by the courts.

Application:

- **Quantum Meruit Factors:** Applied by evaluating time, skill, complexity, and results to ensure reasonable compensation for legal services rendered.

Historical Background:

This case exemplifies late 20th-century legal dynamics in land disputes and attorney-client compensation in the Philippines, underscoring the evolving judicial oversight regarding professional fees amidst contractual relations. The decision reinforces judicial checks against potential exploitative contractual attorney's fees, emphasizing equity and fairness in

legal practice.