

EDUARDO JOSON, ET AL., PETITIONERS-APPELLANTS VS. BIENVENIDO LAPUZ, RESPONDENTS-APPELLEES.*G.R. No. L-10739. May 30, 1958*

Ponente: REYES, A., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/0a7c1da19fb0/>**REYES, A., J.:**

Petition to review a decision of the Court of Agrarian Relations, petitioners being respondents in the case decided against them by said court.

Lucia vda. de Tinio was the owner of an hacienda in barrio Bantug, Licab, Nueva Ecija with 8 tenants (the respondents herein). The hacienda having been leased by her to one of the petitioners herein Eduardo Joson, then mayor of the municipality of Quezon in that same province, the latter some time in 1950, acting through his overseer Candido Cruz, a lieutenant of his civilian guards, ejected old tenants from the land and put in their stead his co-petitioners here in, who were then members of his civilian guards. For fear of Mayor Joson and his civilian guards, the ousted tenants did not then report the matter to the authorities. But in the early part of 1954, having heard Judge Arsenio Roldan of the Court of Industrial Relations declare in conferences held in that province, that tenants who had been unlawfully ejected from their landholdings had the right to be reinstated, the old tenants, on March 4, 1954, filed a petition in the Court of Industrial Relations asking that they be reinstated. Made respondents in that petition were the landowner Lucia vda. de Tinio and her lessee Eduardo Joson, But the petition was amended to include as respondents the other petitioners herein and also to have one of the petitioners, who had already died, substituted by his widow.

Answering the complaint, the landowner admitted having leased the land in 1949 to Mayor Joson and that, in that same agricultural year, Joson put his men on the land in place of the old tenants. And affirming that she had nothing to do with the ejection, she manifested that as the lease had already expired she was willing to have the old tenants reinstated if the new occupants would vacate the premises.

Joson's men, the new occupants, answered, claiming that the old tenants were dismissed with cause and also invoking prescription as a special defense.

Joson did not answer the petition although in one of the hearings he manifested in open court that he had never leased the land from its owner and could, therefore, not have ejected the landowner's old tenants.

The case having been transferred to the Court of Agrarian Relations, that court, after considering the evidence, rendered its decision, the dispositive part of which reads as follows:

"IN VIEW OF ALL THE FOREGOING, respondents Macario Pineda, Felix Mesina, Domingo Mesina, Procopio Calison, Rolando Vicente, Dominador Pineda and Florentino Floras, the present occupants of the landholdings of petitioners Bienvenido Lapuz, Silvino Jaime, Isaias Madriega, Benjamin de la Merced, Gertrudo Rimando, Valentin Domingo and Francisco Jacinto located at barrio Bantug, Licab, Nueva Ecija, are ordered to vacate the same effective at the close of the agricultural year 1955-56 but in no case later than April 30, 1956,

"Thereafter, respondent Lucia vda. de Tinio is directed to reinstate said petitioners in their respective landholdings with all the rights recorded and the obligations imposed by law, except petitioner Isaias Madriaga, now deceased, when she may replace with another tenant of her choice, preference to be given to the wife and children of the deceased, if physically capable of farm work.

"The petitioners' reinstatement shall be without prejudice to their filing of claim for damages against respondent Eduardo Joson by virtue of their unlawful ejectment."

Not satisfied with the decision, the respondents below, with the exception of the landowner, brought the case here for review, alleging that the court below erred:

- In ordering the petitioners herein to vacate the land-holdings before decisions has become final and conclusive;
- In ordering the petitioners to vacate landholdings before the decision has become final and conclusive without requiring the posting of bonds from the respondent;
- In giving preferential right to the wife and children of a deceased tenant over that of a tenant who is in actual possession in good faith;
- In reinstating the respondents to the land-holdings without obtaining the prior consent of their present landholders and without terminating their tenancy relations with such landholder for just cause;
- In not holding that the respondents have abandoned their landholdings and are not entitled to reinstatement.
- In ejecting the petitioners herein without just and lawful cause in accordance with law in stead of imposing fine or damages on the erring land holder;
- In its finding that petitioner Eduardo Joson was the lessee of the landholding;
- In not holding that Candido Cruz was the lessee of the lands and Eduardo Joson was only a guarantor; and
- In holding that the respondents were unlawfully ejected and that they maintained silence for fear of reprisal.

After going over the record, we find no reason for disturbing the following findings of fact of the lower court (1) that following the lease of the land to Mayor Joson, the latter, through a lieutenant of his civilian guards, ousted the old tenants from the land, which they had been cultivating for not less than 16 years, and installed in their place his civilian guards; (2) that the ouster was without lawful cause and against the will of the ousted; and (3) that if they did not report the matter at once to the authorities, it was because they were afraid of Mayor Joson and his civilian guards. This disposes of alleged errors Nos. 5, 7, 8 and 9.

Under section 50 of the Agricultural Tenancy Act, a tenant cannot be dispossessed except for causes enumerated therein. With the exception of abandonment, none of those causes is invoked, and wilful abandonment is not to be deduced from the way the old tenants were ejected in this case.

Having been illegally deprived of their landholdings, the old tenants had a right to be reinstated. But it is contended that the new occupants are themselves tenants, not mere intruders, and they cannot be ejected before the decision in the case has become final and without the old tenants filing a bond. But the law requires no such bond and, as the trial court has found - and we think correctly - the new occupants "are, in legal contemplation, not tenants at all, since they entered upon the landholding under illegal circumstances and from indications, were even privy with the respondent Eduardo Joson in the illegal and summary ejectment of tenant-petitioners." This disposes of alleged errors Nos. 1 and 2.

In connection with the 3rd specification of errors, the petitioners claim that the court had no authority to require

the landholder to choose from among the heirs of the deceased tenant Isaias Madriaga the one to succeed him in the land-holding on the theory that under section 9 of the Agricultural Tenancy Act, the heirs of a deceased tenant have the right to continue working only up to the close of the agricultural year in which their predecessor in interest died. But the landholder did not appeal from this ruling, for she is not a party to the present petition, while, on the other hand, in the answer filed by her in the court below she manifested her willingness to reinstate her old tenants since her lease to Mayor Joson had already expired.

In connection with the 4th specification of error, petitioners claim that three of the herein respondents are now tenants of another landowner, Macaria Tinio de Domingo, and to reinstate them in their former landholdings without Macaria Tinio's consent, is contrary to section 24, paragraph 1 of the Agricultural Tenancy Act. This, however, should not be any concern of the herein petitioners. On the other hand, no showing has been made that Macaria Tinio de Domingo is opposed to the reinstatement of these three respondents. Moreover, the law does not prohibit a tenant from cultivating two or more landholdings so long as the total area of these does not exceed five hectares, and there is no showing in this case that the holdings of these three respondents would exceed that area if they were restored to their former holdings.

As to alleged error No. 6, sentencing herein petitioners merely to pay damages instead of making them vacate the land to give way to the old occupants would be contrary to the purpose of the Agricultural Tenancy Act, which is to give security of tenure to legitimate tenants.

In view of the foregoing, the decision below is affirmed with costs against the petitioner.

Paras, C.J., Bengzon, Montemayor, Bautista Angelo, Labrador, Concepcion, Reyes, J.B.L., Endencia, and Felix, JJ., concur.

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.