

**\*\*Title:** Diosdado C. Ty vs. Filipinas Compañia de Seguros, et al., G.R. Nos. L-16133-16145**\*\***

**\*\*Facts:\*\***

Diosdado C. Ty was employed as a mechanic-operator at the Broadway Cotton Factory, earning a monthly salary of P185. In the latter part of 1953, Ty took out several Personal Accident Policies from various insurance companies, including the defendants: Filipinas Compañia de Seguros, People's Surety & Insurance Co., Inc., South Sea Surety & Insurance Co., Inc., The Philippine Guaranty Company, Inc., Universal Insurance & Indemnity Co., and Plaridel Surety & Insurance Co., Inc. These policies were all effective for 12 months.

On December 24, 1953, a fire broke out in Ty's workplace. While attempting to extinguish the fire, a heavy object fell on his left hand. Ty was treated at the National Orthopedic Hospital from December 26, 1953, to February 8, 1954, for several injuries, including multiple fractures and lacerations. The attending surgeon certified that these injuries resulted in the temporary total disability of his left hand.

When Ty sought compensation under the insurance policies for his disability, his claims were denied. He subsequently filed actions in the Municipal Courts of Manila. The Municipal Courts ruled in his favor, but the insurance companies appealed to the Court of First Instance (CFI) of Manila, which consolidated and dismissed the six separate complaints. The court ruled that the policies only provided compensation for the loss of a hand by amputation through the bones of the wrist, which did not occur in Ty's case.

Ty then appealed the CFI decision to the Supreme Court.

**\*\*Issues:\*\***

1. What constitutes "loss of a hand" under the insurance policies?
2. Is temporary total disability resulting from fractures sufficient to claim compensation if there is no amputation?
3. What is the proper interpretation of the "loss of a hand" provision in the insurance policies?

**\*\*Court's Decision:\*\***

The Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the Court of First Instance, resolving each issue as follows:

1. **Loss of a Hand Definition:**

- The Court held that the definition of “loss of a hand” in the insurance policies was clear and unambiguous. According to the policies, “loss of a hand” specifically meant amputation through the bones of the wrist. Since Ty’s injuries did not result in such amputation, he could not claim compensation under this clause.

2. **Temporary Total Disability:**

- The Court noted that even though Ty’s left hand was temporarily totally disabled due to the fractures, the insurance policies explicitly required amputation for a claim. Temporary total disability, characterized by the fractures and lacerations Ty sustained, did not meet the requirements stipulated in the policies for compensation.

3. **Interpretation of Policy Terms:**

- The Court reiterated the principle that insurance contracts are to be understood according to their plain, literal meaning unless ambiguous. Here, the provision was clear that “loss of a hand” required amputation. The Court declared that they cannot modify the terms of the insurance contract to interpret “loss of a hand” more broadly to include Ty’s condition.

**Doctrine:**

- “The agreement contained in the insurance policies is the law between the parties.” Therefore, clear and unambiguous terms in an insurance contract must be enforced as written.

- “Loss of a hand” under an accident insurance policy specifically means amputation through the bones of the wrist if such is defined explicitly within the policy.

**Class Notes:**

- **Key Elements:**

- Definition of disability and indemnity under insurance contracts.
- Importance of clear, express, and specific terms in contract interpretation.

- **Relevant Statutes/Provisions:**

- Insurance policy provisions defining “loss of a hand” as amputation through the bones of the wrist.

- **Application:**

- In this case, the Supreme Court enforced the literal meaning of the policy terms,

emphasizing that contracts, especially insurance contracts, are governed by their explicit provisions unless proven ambiguous.

**\*\*Historical Background:\*\***

During the 1950s, the insurance industry in the Philippines was becoming more prominent, with individuals taking out personal accident policies as a safety net against unforeseen events. Diosdado C. Ty's case reflects the era's contractual strictness and the judiciary's reluctance to interpret clear terms beyond their ordinary meaning. The Supreme Court's ruling in this case solidified the precedent that insurance claims are strictly governed by the terms of the contract, a stance aimed at maintaining contractual certainty in the insurance sector.