

**Title:** Municipality of Tiwi v. Antonio B. Betito

**Facts:**

- Background:** This case arose from a Complaint for Sum of Money filed by Antonio B. Betito against the Municipality of Tiwi, Albay. Betito sought the enforcement of a Contract of Legal Services for a 10% contingent fee regarding the recovery of realty taxes from the National Power Corporation (NPC).
- Realty Tax Issue:** The legal service agreement was rooted in NPC's unpaid realty taxes for properties in Albay, leading to a contractual arrangement for legal services between Betito, Atty. Lawenko, and Tiwi's then-Mayor Corral.
- Contractual Basis:** The contract stipulated a 10% fee on any recovered realty taxes due largely to Betito's legal efforts.
- Proceedings Begin:** Albay attempted to retain NPC's initial payments citing these as earnest money aimed at satisfying tax liabilities. Betito argued that Tiwi was entitled to its share under existing agreements and sought enforcement of Tiwi's rights.
- Initial Court Findings:** Tiwi contested the legality and scope of the contract, asserting Mayor Corral lacked authority to bind Tiwi to 10% contingency fees, and that Tiwi's realty tax recoveries were not exclusively attributable to Betito's efforts.
- RTC Partial Judgment (2001):** In a partial judgment, the RTC ruled favorably for Betito, equating his fees to 10% of the amounts already admitted as received by Tiwi.
- CA Affirmation (2005):** The CA affirmed RTC's decision ruling that the fees stipulated in the contract agreed upon were consistent with jurisprudence allowing 10% contingency fees.
- Supreme Court Intervention (2010 Tiwi Case):** The Supreme Court identified issues with the appropriateness of the agreed fee, highlighting the necessity of a trial to determine a fair fee reflective of actual legal services contributed to the recovery of taxes.
- Case Remand (2013):** The case was remanded for further proceedings but was mishandled, lacking a trial to define attorney fees as ordered by the Supreme Court.
- Subsequent RTC Decision (2013):** The RTC reaffirmed Betito's entitlement to 10% based on the broad reading of the contract, specifying collected amounts from NPC as the

base for fee calculations.

11. **CA's Modified Affirmation (2019):** The CA affirmed the RTC's decision but deleted imposed interest on fees, remanding the case for a recalibrated evaluation of just attorney fees.

12. **Appeal & Current Petition:** Tiwi contested CA's decisions leading to the current review by the Supreme Court focusing on the fee's reasonableness correlated directly to Betito's service contributions.

**Issues:**

1. **Reasonableness of Contingency Fees:** Was the 10% contingency fee reasonable considering that the tax recovery wasn't solely attributed to Betito's service?
2. **Extent and Benefit of Betito's Services:** What was the nature and extent of legal work by Betito that directly attributed to the recovery of Tiwi's tax share?
3. **Principle of Quantum Meruit Application:** Should the amount be based only on the actual benefit derived by Tiwi from Betito's services rather than the contract's stipulated rate?

**Court's Decision:**

1. **Remand for Trial:** The Supreme Court found the need for a full trial to ascribe the reasonable amount of attorney's fees relating realty tax benefits directly from Betito's efforts rather than merely acknowledging broad contract terms.
2. **Clarification on Fees:** The trail must weigh on the contractual obligations against the actual legal contributions significantly impacting the tax recoveries earned by Tiwi from NPC.
3. **Quantum Meruit Over Contract Rates:** Given that Betito's contributions were pivotal but not exhaustive relative to Tiwi's recoveries, compensations aligned more suitably with the principle of quantum meruit should be evaluated, restraining the absolute 10% contractual clause.

**Doctrine:**

1. **Quantum Meruit in Contingency:** An attorney's compensation is subject to judicial scrutiny to confirm it aligns reasonably with the legal work executed, particularly where recovery may not substantively derive from claimed services novated by broader governmental directives or unilateral errors.

2. **Contractual Limitations in Attorney's Fees:** The engagements beyond given authority notably circumscribe contractual claims for attorney's fees; full authority and benefit corollary must be demonstrated.

**Class Notes:**

- **Contractual Limits in Contingency Agreements:** Agreements must be validly authored under institutional authority; excess claims need proper legal empowerment.
- **Quantum Meruit:** Integral doctrine in assessing attorney fees balancing service rendered against situational benefit when formal agreements are substantively barred from broader application.
- **Attorney Fee Supervision:** Courts maintain duty in ensuring legality, reasonableness, and fairness in the settling of legal service agreements.

**Historical Background:**

The case stemmed from a significant ripple leading from landmark decisions related to public enterprise taxation disputes in the Philippines, illuminating complex financial settlements involving organizational shares in public tax revenues, reflecting broader institutional dynamics during the period of sweeping reformations in local governance frameworks in the 1990s. The tension between province and municipality around equal share rights over tax imbursements underscores institutional law adjustment evident in transitioning prerogatives between national and local governance bodies, influenced, in part, by the evolving legal interpretative ecosystem in the Philippines.