

**BASES CONVERSION AND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, PETITIONER,
VS. ROMEO S. CARIÑO, MARIA LORETA C. MORALES, ALEXANDER
CARIÑO, CONSUELO C. BALLESTEROS, AND THE HEIRS OF SESENIO
CARIÑO ...**

Ponente: CORALES, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/0b21d2ded253/>

CORALES, J.:

This is a Petition for Certiorari[1] under Rule 65 of the Rules of Court seeking the nullification of the April 26, 2012[2] and August 2, 2012[3] Orders of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 66, San Fernando, La Union in Civil Case No. 7291 for declaration of nullity of documents, recovery of possession and/or payment of just compensation and damages, entitled “Romeo Cariño, et al. v. Bases Conversion Development Authority ” (the declaration of nullity case). The assailed Orders respectively denied the Bases Conversion Development Authority's (BCDA) Motion to Direct Clerk of Court to Make a Deficiency Assessment and for Plaintiffs to Pay the Correct Amount of Docket Fees[4] (motion for deficiency assessment) and its subsequent motion for reconsideration.

The Antecedents

BCDA owns, holds, and administers the former American military reservations in the Philippines, such as the Wallace Air Station in San Fernando, Pampanga, pursuant to the mandates of Republic Act No. 7227 otherwise known as the Bases Conversion and Development Act of 1992.

In the course of BCDA's management of the Poro Point Special Economic and Freeport Zone, it caused the survey of Cadastral Lot No. 50545, the adjoining land of Wallace Air Station. On July 4, 1997, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) approved the survey as SWO-01-003243.[5]

Several years later, private respondents Maria Loreta C. Morales, Consuelo C. Ballesteros, Romeo and Alexander Cariño, and the heirs of the late Sesenio Cariño, namely Gregoria, Christine, Daisy, Sandra, Eric, and Marissa (the Cariños, et al.) filed a Protest[6] with the DENR claiming that they had been in possession of Cadastral Lot No. 50545 in the concept of owners since time immemorial. They sought the cancellation of SWO-01-003243 and/or its correction to include their names as survey claimants of Cadastral Lot No. 50545.

In 2007, the Cariños, et al. instituted the declaration of nullity case before the RTC claiming ownership over certain portions of Cadastral Lot Nos. 6182 and 50545 with an aggregate assessed value of P104,770.00. Allegedly, Cadastral Lot No. 6182 was surveyed under SWO-40369 which was approved on February 8, 1962 but amended on July 4, 1997. They inherited the subject properties from their late father Januario Cariño and since time immemorial, they and their predecessors-in-interest had been in continuous and open occupation of the same in the concept of owners until the State unjustly took possession from them sometime in 2004 through force, stealth, and intimidation. They sought the nullification of SWO-40369, SWO-01-003243, and the corresponding tax declarations issued in BCDA's name and prayed that they be declared as owners of Cadastral Lot Nos. 6182 and 50545 and be restored to the possession thereof, or, in the alternative, to be paid just compensation for the

taking and moral and exemplary damages plus attorney's fees.[7]

In their Answer with Compulsory Counterclaim,[8] BCDA averred that Cadastral Lot No. 6182 is a US Military reservation while its adjoining lot, Cadastral Lot No. 50545, is a government property previously occupied by the Americans. The Cariños, et al. were never in possession of the parcels of land and their private survey was not approved by the DENR. It accused the Cariños, et al. of forum shopping due to the pending case before the DENR Office in San Fernando, La Union.

Subsequently, BCDA filed the motion for deficiency assessment arguing that the total valuation of the two (2) parcels of land was P387,410.00 and the P13,015.00 docket fees paid by the Cariños, et al. were insufficient.[9]

The Ruling of the RTC

After an exchange of pleadings,[10] the RTC rendered its April 26, 2012 Order¹¹ denying BCDA's motion for deficiency assessment. It held that the principal relief prayed by the Cariños, et al. was the declaration of nullity of survey plans, tax declarations, and muniments issued to BCDA and the prayer for just compensation was merely incidental to the main action. Thus, the subject matter of the litigation is incapable of pecuniary estimation and the docket fees were appropriately computed based on paragraph (b) of Section 7, Rule 141 of the Rules of Court, not on paragraph (a), which required the fair market value of the realty, as erroneously suggested by BCDA.

The dispositive portion of the April 26, 2012 Order reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the defendants' "Motion to Direct Clerk of Court to Make a Deficiency Assessment and for Plaintiffs to Pay the Correct Amount of Docket Fees" is hereby DENIED for lack of merit.

SO ORDERED.

BCDA moved for reconsideration but the RTC denied the same through its August 2, 2012 Order.[12]

Undeterred, BCDA interposed the instant petition for certiorari premised on the following grounds:[13]

- JUDGE CONCEPCION GRAVELY ABUSED HIS DISCRETION TANTAMOUNT TO LACK OR EXCESS OF JURISDICTION WHEN HE DENIED BCDA'S MOTION TO DIRECT THE CLERK OF COURT TO MAKE A DEFICIENCY ASSESSMENT AND FOR PLAINTIFFS (PRIVATE RESPONDENTS) TO PAY THE CORRECT DOCKET FEES BECAUSE THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE CASE IS SURELY CAPABLE OF PECUNIARY ESTIMATION.

- JUDGE CONCEPCION GRAVELY ABUSED HIS DISCRETION TANTAMOUNT TO LACK OR EXCESS OF JURISDICTION WHEN HE DENIED BCDA'S MOTION TO DIRECT THE CLERK OF COURT TO MAKE A DEFICIENCY ASSESSMENT AND FOR PLAINTIFFS (PRIVATE RESPONDENTS) TO PAY THE CORRECT DOCKET FEES BECAUSE THE RELIEF SOUGHT FOR JUST COMPENSATION IS NOT MERELY INCIDENTAL TO THE MAIN ACTION.

BCDA insists that the case is a real action capable of pecuniary estimation and the docket fees should be based on the assessed or alleged value of the subject property. It argues that the RTC committed grave abuse of discretion, not mere error of judgment, when it disregarded the following circumstances: (a) the Cariños, et al. acknowledged that their complaint is capable of pecuniary estimation when they sought an alternative relief for payment of just compensation; (b) the Cariños, et al. ultimately prayed that they be declared as the lawful owners of Cadastral Lot No. 50545 ; and (c) the Clerk of Court computed the attorney's fees based on the market value of the property. It further contends that the RTC's Order is a hasty and sweeping conclusion, unsupported by law and contrary to settled jurisprudence.[14]

The Cariños, et al. failed to file their Comment despite notice.

This Court's Ruling

The petition lacks merit.

Indeed, the declaration of nullity case involved real properties. However, a careful perusal of the allegations of the complaint shows that the Cariños, et al. primarily challenged the validity of the taking of their alleged properties and assailed the various documents upon which such taking had been premised. The prayer of just compensation is just an alternative relief, not the main cause of action. The disquisition in *De Ungria v. Court of Appeals*[15] is instructive on this matter, viz.:

It would appear that the first cause of action involves the issue of recovery of possession and interest of the parties over the subject land which is a real action. x x x

Notably, however, respondents in the same Complaint filed alternative causes of action assailing the validity of the Deed of Transfer of Rights and Interest executed by Fernando in favor of petitioner's father. Respondents also sought for the reconveyance to respondent Rosario of the undivided one-half portion of the subject land as conjugal owner thereof in case the Deed of Transfer of Rights and Interest will be upheld as valid; and/or for redemption of the subject land. Clearly, this is a case of joinder of causes of action which comprehends more than the issue of possession of, or any interest in the real property under contention, but includes an action to annul contracts and reconveyance which are incapable of pecuniary estimation and, thus, properly within the jurisdiction of the RTC.

In *Singson v. Isabella Sawmill*, we held that:

In determining whether an action is one the subject matter of which is not capable of pecuniary estimation this Court has adopted the criterion of first ascertaining the nature of the principal action or remedy sought. x x x However, where the basic issue is something other than the right to recover a sum of money, where the money claim is purely incidental to, or a consequence of, the principal relief sought, this Court has considered such actions as cases where the subject of litigation may not be estimated in terms of money, and are cognizable exclusively by courts of first instance (now Regional Trial Courts).

x x x

Since we find that the case involved the annulment of contract which is not susceptible of pecuniary estimation, thus, falling within the jurisdiction of the RTC, the docket fees should not be based on the assessed value of the subject land as claimed by petitioner in their memorandum, but should be based on Section 7(b)(1) of Rule 141. x x x (Emphasis supplied; citations omitted).

Similarly, the primary issue in this case comprehends more than the issue of possession but includes an action to annul the survey plan and the reconveyance of the properties to the Cariños, et al. Accordingly, the RTC properly categorized the declaration of nullity case as incapable of pecuniary estimation and the Clerk of Court correctly computed the filing fees based on Section 7 (b)(1), Rule 141 of the Rules of Court.

The *De Ungria* case must be adhered by the courts pursuant to the fundamental principle of *stare decisis et non quieta movere* which means “to adhere to precedents, and not to unsettle things which are established”. This doctrine stems from the necessity of securing certainty and stability of judicial decisions, thus, once the highest Court has laid down a principle of law as applicable to a certain state of facts, it will adhere to that principle and apply it to all future cases where facts are substantially the same.[16] It may not be amiss to state that sound policy dictates adherence to the more recent precedent, such as the *Ungria* case, which is deemed to supersede prior decisions to the contrary.[17]

Since the RTC acted in complete accord with law and jurisprudence when it denied BCDA's motion for deficiency assessment, it cannot be said to have gravely abused its discretion.[18] An act of a court or tribunal

may only be considered to have been committed in grave abuse of discretion when the same was performed in a capricious or whimsical exercise of judgment, which is equivalent to lack of jurisdiction. The abuse of discretion must be so patent and gross as to amount to an evasion of a positive duty or to a virtual refusal to perform a duty enjoined by law or to act at all in contemplation of law, as where the power is exercised in an arbitrary and despotic manner by reason of passion or personal hostility. No such circumstance exists herein as to justify the issuance of a writ of certiorari.[19]

WHEREFORE, the instant petition for certiorari is hereby DISMISSED for lack of merit. The assailed April 26, 2012 and August 2, 2012 Orders of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 66, San Fernando, La Union in Civil Case No. 7291 are AFFIRMED. The RTC is directed to proceed with utmost dispatch in the trial of Civil Case No. 7291.

SO ORDERED.

Villon, J., Chairperson and Zalameda, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, pages 3-19.

[2] Penned by Presiding Judge Victor O. Concepcion, *ibid.*, pages 23-24.

[3] *Ibid.*, page 25.

[4] *Ibid.*, pages 95-100.

[5] See Survey Plan SWO-01-003243, *ibid.*, page 26.

[6] *Ibid.*, pages 27-29.

[7] See Amended Complaint for Declaration of Nullity of Documents, Recovery of Possession and/or Payment of Just Compensation with Damages, *ibid.*, pages 30-40.

[8] *Ibid.*, pages 72-83.

[9] See Motion to Direct Clerk of Court to Make a Deficiency Assessment and for Plaintiffs to Pay the Correct Amount of Docket Fees, *supra*, at note 4.

[10] See Comment on the Motion to Direct Clerk of Court to Make a Deficiency Assessment and for Plaintiffs to Pay the Correct Amount of Docket Fees and Reply to the Clerk of Court's Comments, *rollo*, pages 103-104 and 105-109, respectively.

[11] *Supra*, at note 2.

[12] See assailed Orders, *supra*, at note 3.

[13] See page 6 of the Petition, *supra*, at note 1.

[14] See pages 7-17 of the Petition, *supra*, at note 1.

[15] G.R. No. 165777. July 25, 2011.

[16] See *GSIS v. Buenviaje-Carreon*, G.R. No. 189529. August 10, 2012; *Ty v. Banco Filipino*, G.R. No. 188302. June 27, 2012.

[17] See *Kukan International v. Reyes*, G.R. No. 182729. September 29, 2010; *Saquilayan v. COMELEC*, G.R.

No. 157249. November 28, 2003.

[18] See *Philippine Amusement v. Court of Appeals*, G.R. No. 185668. December 13, 2011.

[19] See *Malana v. Tappa*, G.R. No. 181303. September 17, 2009.

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.