

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, PETITIONER, VS. HONORABLE SANTIAGO O. TAÑADA, AS JUDGE OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF CEBU, BRANCH V, HO HANG LIET AND THE MINORS MICHAEL GO HO, ...

G.R. NO. L-31664. August 30, 1974

Ponente: FERNANDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/087280aadd7a/>

FERNANDO, J.:

It is not easy to explain why on such a matter as the change of name, some courts of first instance would be at times, still unable to perceive the public interest involved and thus without due regard to authoritative pronouncements from this Tribunal grant such a petition. So it did happen in this case. The lower court decision now under review authorized respondent Ho Hang Liet to change his name to Hanley L. Young.[1] The ostensible justification was that as a naturalized citizen, he was desirous of being identified in a language easy to pronounce and remember, his Chinese appellation being awkward and difficult to pronounce. The opposition filed by the then Solicitor-General, now Associate Justice, Felix B. Makasiar, was based on binding precedents, primarily *Yu Chi Han vs. Republic*[2] and *Ong Te vs. Republic*. [3] The lower court was unimpressed, resulting in the aforesaid judgment. Hence this petition for review.

The decision of the lower court cannot stand the test of scrutiny and therefore must be reversed.

The strictness with which the judiciary views an attempt to change one's name is one of the accepted truisms of the law. It is the court's duty, as Justice J.B.L. Reyes pointed out, in *Oan vs. Republic*, [4] "to consider carefully the consequences of the change of name, and to deny the same unless weighty reasons are shown. It must not be forgotten that the State has an interest in the names borne by individuals and entities for purposes of identification, and that a change of name is a privilege and not a matter of right." [5] That was in 1957. In 1970, in *Ang Chay vs. Republic*, [6] there was a further elaboration of the matter in a still latter opinion by the same jurist: "We find no error in the decision of the court below. It is a ruling of long standing in this jurisdiction that change of name is not a matter of right; that being a privilege, before it can be authorized, the person petitioning for such a change must first show proper cause of compelling reason therefor." [7] No such compelling reason is present in this case. The mere fact that his present Chinese name may cause difficulty in pronunciation and that as a naturalized citizen he would want to adopt one in accordance with the Philippine custom, do not meet such a standard. If such were really the case, it defies rational explanation why an Anglo-Saxon name was chosen. Moreover, respondent Ho Hang Liet should be aware that it is no longer unusual in the Philippines to have family names composed of Chinese words. The list of respectable individuals in that category is quite impressive. It is far better then, with the needs of the public in mind, that the change sought be not granted. That would be to avoid confusion and wrong identification as in the meanwhile, the people he must have dealt with had known him by his real name. Public interest is thus better served. It is not, to repeat, individual preference that counts. Respondent Ho Hang Liet must ever keep that in mind.

WHEREFORE, the order of respondent Judge of December 12, 1969, granting the petition for a change of name, is hereby reversed and set aside. No costs.

Zaldivar, (Chairman), Barredo, Fernandez, and Aquino, JJ., concur.

Antonio, J., took no part.

[1] His minor children were allowed respectively to do so, respondents Michael Go Ho to Michael G. Young and John Go Ho to John G. Young.

[2] L-22040, November 29, 1965, 15 SCRA 454.

[3] L-15549, June 30, 1962, 5 SCRA 484.

[4] 102 Phil. 468 (1957).

[5] Ibid, 470.

[6] L-28507, July 31, 1970, 34 SCRA 224.

[7] Ibid, 227.

ABOUT BATAS.ORG

Study smarter at BATAS.org

The Philippine bar review and law-school companion built around how your brain actually remembers.

The complete Philippine law library - free for everyone.

More than 100,000 Supreme Court decisions, Republic Acts, and executive issuances - full-text searchable, browsable by category and year, and always free. No paywall, no login. This PDF came from it.

Audio case-brief lectures.

Any decision becomes a podcast-style lecture - facts, issues, ruling, and doctrine - with read-along highlighting and a hands-free presentation mode. Study while commuting, working out, or resting your eyes.

Bar review built on the science of memory.

Complete, sequenced courses for all eight bar subjects, narrated like podcasts and reinforced with retrieval practice and spaced review - the study techniques with the strongest evidence behind them.

The full law-school curriculum.

One subscription unlocks the entire J.D. curriculum - every subject, every lesson, with your progress tracked down to the paragraph so you can pick up exactly where you left off, on any device.

Mock exams that tell you where you stand.

Timed multiple-choice exams graded instantly, with per-subject score breakdowns and focus suggestions that point you at your weakest topics first.

A study planner that keeps you on pace.

Set your schedule and BATAS tells you every day whether you are on track for bar day - and exactly which lesson to take next.

Start free at <https://batas.org>

The law library is free forever - and your first lesson is one click away.

The text of this document is an official public record and remains in the public domain. Formatting, presentation, and compilation © 2026 batas.org.

Downloaded free from the batas.org Law Library. Share it freely - the library is free for every law student, bar reviewee, and practitioner.