

GOVERNMENT SERVICE INSURANCE SYSTEM, PETITIONER-APPELLEE, VS. REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, OPPOSITOR-APPELLANT.

Ponente: PAREDES, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/0cce250be7c1/>

PAREDES, J.:

THE CASE

THIS IS ON THE APPEAL filed by oppositor-appellant Republic of the Philippines (Republic) assailing the Decision[1] dated September 5, 2011 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 87, Quezon City, in LRC Case No. Q-20496(05) for reconstitution of original copy of transfer certificate of title filed by petitioner-appellee Government Service Insurance System (GSIS).

THE ANTECEDENTS

On September 28, 2005, GSIS filed a petition[2] for reconsitution and issuance of original and new owner's duplicate copy of Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. 183751, Registry of Deeds of Quezon City, in lieu of the lost title. GSIS alleged that: it is an assignee of a parcel of land including all improvements thereon situated in Novaliches, Quezon City, particularly described as follows:

A parcel of land (Lot 26, Block 55 [Sheet 2] of the consolidation/subdivision plan {LRA} PCS-12965, being a portion of the consolidation of Lots 1 and 4, (LRC) PCS-12892, LRC Rec. No. 6563), situated in the Dist. Of Novaliches, Quezon City, Island of Luzon. Bounded on the E., points 4 to 1 by Lot 27, on the SE., points 1 to 2 by Road Lot 75 and on the NW., points 3 to 4 by Lot 24, Block 55, all of the consolidation subdivision plan. Beginning at a point marked "1" on plan deg. S. 34 deg. 03'W., 1306.44 m. from L.M. No. 13, Tala Estate; thence N. 16 deg. 01'W., 20.0 m. to point 2; thence N. 73 deg. 59'W., 10.00 m. to point 3; thence N. 16 deg. 01'E, 20.00 m. to point 4; thence 73 deg. 59'E., 10.00 m. to the point of beginnings; containing an area of TWO HUNDRED (200) SQUARE METERS, more or less. All points referred to are indicated on the plan and are marked on the ground by P.S. Cyl. Conc. Mons. 15 x 60 cm, bearing true; declination 0 deg. 48'E, date of original survey, during 1907, and that of the consolidation subdivision survey, executed by Ariston F. Sevilla, Geodetic Engineer, on Dec. 1-15, 1971.

the parcel of land is covered by TCT No. 183751, registered in the name of Lagro Development and Realty Corporation (LDRC), and was assigned to GSIS under a Deed of Absolute Sale with Assignment; GSIS, in turn, sold the same on installment basis to Carmen V. Rael and Edilberto K. Rael (spouses Rael) under a Deed of Conditional Sale; under the terms of the deed, GSIS was to keep possession and custody of the owner's duplicate of the TCT for the duration of the term of the loan and after full payment, only then will the owner's duplicate of the TCT be released to the spouses Rael; however, after full payment of the spouses Rael, the owner's duplicate of the TCT could not be found in the vault of the Fund Management and Control Department of the GSIS; despite diligent search to find and locate the same, the owner's duplicate of the TCT remained missing and was then declared missing and lost; the loss of the owner's duplicate of the TCT was registered with the Register of Deeds

(RD) of Quezon City; upon further verification with the RD, it was found that the original copy of TCT No. 183751 was among those burned during the fire on June 11, 1988 that razed and gutted the Registry of Deeds of Quezon City which had its offices at the City Hall; there is no other co-owner's copy or other duplicate of said title that has been issued; there is no building nor any improvement existing or introduced on the parcel of land covered by the TCT which does not belong to the assignee; the property is free from all liens and encumbrances of any kind whatsoever, except those that may be due to GSIS as assignee; no other deed or instrument exists affecting the said property that might have been presented for and/or pending registration with the RD; and the lot has been declared for taxation purposes. GSIS prayed that after due notice and hearing, an order be issued directing the RD of Quezon City, Metro Manila, to reconstitute the original copy of TCT No. 183751 and to issue a new owner's duplicate copy and declaring as null and void the lost owner's duplicate copy of the aforesaid title.

Finding the petition sufficient in form and substance, the RTC issued an Order[3] dated January 18, 2006, setting the hearing on June 29, 2006 and directed that: (1) the order be published in the Official Gazette for two (2) consecutive dates; (2) copies of the Order be posted at the main entrances of the City Hall and Hall of Justice Building, as well as at the bulletin board of the barangay hall where the property is situated; and (3) copies of the order be sent to the adjoining property owners with proof of compliance submitted to the court.

During the hearing, the RTC granted[4] GSIS ninety (90) days within which to file the appropriate motion corresponding to their compliance with the requirements. Thereafter, the GSIS manifested[5] its compliance with the requirements laid down by the Chief of the Reconstitution Division of the Land Registration Authority (LRA) in his letter, including the submission of: (a) original with two (2) duplicate copies and a xerox of the technical description of the land, certified by the authorized officer of the LRA; (b) certified copy of lot data computation or area computation prepared by a duly licensed Geodetic Engineer; and (c) sepia film plan with two (2) print copies of the parcel of land prepared by a duly licensed engineer.

After compliance with the jurisdictional requirements to which no objections were interposed, the RTC set[6] the reception of evidence ex-parte. GSIS filed its Formal Offer[7] of Exhibits on December 22, 2006. All the exhibits of GSIS were admitted in the Order dated July 6, 2007[8]. On July 9, 2007, the Office of the Solicitor General (OSG) filed its Comment[9] to the formal offer of GSIS registering its objection to the admission of Exhibits "I" to "J" due to the non-approval of the LRA in accordance with Republic Act No. 26[10] (RA No. 26).

Subsequently, the LRA submitted[11] its Report dated September 21, 2007, highlighting the non-compliance of the GSIS with one of the requirements set out in RA No. 26, that the subdivision plan it submitted was not approved by the appropriate officer of the LRA. A hearing was set[12] anew on April 24, 2008, during which counsel for GSIS asked, and was granted[13], time within which to present additional evidence.

GSIS presented Liza Cornejo of the GSIS Registration and Records Department. She testified[14] on the circumstances surrounding the loss of the owner's duplicate copy of the TCT, the efforts exerted to locate the document, as well as the actions undertaken after such loss, foremost of which is the execution of a joint affidavit of loss which was registered with the RD.

In an Order[15] dated July 7, 2009, the RTC noted the previous submission of GSIS of its formal offer and the objections interposed by the Republic. Finding the objections to be proper, the RTC denied the admission to Exhibits "I" to "J", offered to prove compliance with the jurisdictional requirements. The RTC then ordered the case archived to be retrieved only upon receipt of a report from the LRA.

The LRA sent an Amended Report[16] dated March 30, 2010, together with a print copy of Plan[17] (LRA) PR-07-01528-R and original copy of the technical description[18] of the lot to the RTC. In its Amended Report, the LRA noted that the plan and technical description were verified correct and approved pursuant to the

provisions of Section 12 of RA No. 26 and recommended that the RD of Quezon City be made to submit a comment on whether or not a reconstituted title of TCT No. 183751 had already been issued. Due to non-compliance of the RD with the directive of the RTC to file its comment, the case was again archived[19] pending receipt of such comment.

On September 22, 2010, the RD submitted its Comment[20]. The RTC reinstated[21] the case and set the continuation of the hearing. GSIS presented its second and last witness, Atty. Carlo Alcantara. At the time of his testimony, Atty. Alcantara was the Deputy RD of the Registry of Deeds of QC and he testified[22] to the issuance of a certification that the original of TCT No. 183751 was among those titles which were destroyed by the fire that razed the Quezon City Hall on June 11, 1988.

Thereafter, GSIS re-marked[23] its exhibits before a Commissioner who then submitted a Report[24] thereon. On May 4, 2011, GSIS submitted another Formal Offer[25] of Exhibits consisting of the following:

Exhibits A to A-3[26]]

Copy of the Petition

Exhibits B to B-5[27]

Court Order dated January
18, 2006 showing receipt of
the interested parties

Exhibits C to C-3[28] (58-9)

Certificate of Posting in the
Barangay Hall

Exhibits D to D-2 -A[29]

Certificate of Publication
and Copies of the Official
Gazette

Exhibit E[30]

Deed of Sale with
Assignment

Exhibit F[31]

Deed of Conditional Sale

Exhibits G to G-3[32]

Joint Affidavit of Loss

Exhibits H to H-1[33]

Certifications issued by the
Register of Deeds of Quezon
City

Exhibits I to I-3[34]

LRA Subdivision Plan

Exhibit J[35]

Duplicate Original of the
LRA Technical Description

Exhibit K[36]

Tax Declaration of Real
Property

Exhibit L[37]

Treasurer's Certification

Exhibits M to M-1[38]

Receipts for Payments of
Real Property Tax

Exhibit N[39]

Amended LRA Report
Dated March 30, 2010

Exhibit O[40]

Inscription PR-46556
(183571), Book No. 118;
Page No. 156 reflecting the
registration of the Joint
Affidavit of Loss

Exhibits “A” to “O” were admitted in the Order⁴¹ dated July 5, 2011. On September 5, 2011, the RTC issued the assailed Decision⁴², disposing of the case in this wise:

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, the petition is hereby granted. The original and owner's duplicate copy of Transfer Certificate of Title No. 183751 of the Register of Deeds of Quezon City are hereby declared lost, and null and void, and of no further legal effect.

The Register of Deeds of Quezon City is hereby directed, after the payment of the required fees, to:

(1) reconstitute the original of Transfer Certificate of Title No. 183751 in the name of Lagro Development and Realty Corporation, based on the approved technical description and location plan submitted to this Court, through the Report of the Land Registration Authority dated March 30, 2010, as well as the Comment filed on September 22, 2010 and,

(2) issue a new owner's duplicate thereof in the name of Lagro Development and Realty Corporation, which shall contain a memorandum of the fact that it is issued in place of the lost title, but shall, in all respects, be entitled to like faith and credit as the original duplicate of Transfer Certificate of Title No. 183751 and shall

thereafter be regarded as such for all purposes, pursuant to Presidential Decree No. 1529.

SO ORDERED[43].

Hence, this appeal[44].

THE ISSUES

The Republic comes before this Court raising the following issues:

I

WHETHER OR NOT THE TRIAL COURT ACQUIRED JURISDICTION OVER THE CASE.

II

WHETHER OR NOT THE FACTUAL AND LEGAL BASES FOR THE DECISION GRANTING THE PETITION FOR RECONSTITUTION WERE DULY PROVED AND ESTABLISHED[45]

In fine, the only issue in this case is whether or not the RTC erred in granting the petition for reconstitution.

THE COURT'S RULING

The appeal is meritorious.

The Republic avers[46] that GSIS failed to comply with the mandatory notice requirement under RA No. 26. Specifically, the Republic points out that LDRC, in whose name the TCT sought to be reconstituted was registered, was never furnished with a copy of the order of hearing. The Republic claims[47] that since the petition for reconstitution was a proceeding in rem, compliance with the requirements under RA No. 26 was a condition sine qua non for the conferment of jurisdiction on the RTC and non-compliance with requirements therein rendered the RTC without jurisdiction over the petition for reconstitution. We agree.

Section 110 of Presidential Decree No. 1529 (PD 1529), otherwise known as the Property Registration Decree, as amended by Republic Act No. 6732[48], allows the reconstitution of lost or destroyed original Torrens Title, to wit:

SEC. 110. Reconstitution of lost or destroyed original of Torrens title. – Original copies of certificates of titles lost or destroyed in the offices of Register of Deeds as well as liens and encumbrances affecting the lands covered by such titles shall be reconstituted judicially in accordance with the procedure prescribed in Republic Act No. 26 insofar as not inconsistent with this Decree. The procedure relative to administrative reconstitution of lost or destroyed certificate prescribed in said Act may be availed of only in case of substantial loss or destruction of land titles due to fire, flood or other force majeure as determined by the Administrator of the Land Registration Authority: Provided, That the number of certificates of titles lost or damaged should be at least ten percent (10%) of the total number in the possession of the Office of the Register of Deeds: Provided, further, that in no case shall the number of certificates of titles lost or damaged be less than five hundred (500) pesos.

Based on the foregoing, reconstitution of a lost or destroyed certificate of title may be done judicially, in accordance with the special procedure laid down in RA No. 26; or administratively, in accordance with the provisions of Republic Act No. 6732[49]. By filing the petition for reconstitution with the RTC, GSIS sought judicial reconstitution of TCT No. 183751, governed by RA No. 26.

The nature of the proceeding for reconstitution of a certificate of title under RA No. 26 denotes a restoration of

the instrument, which is supposed to have been lost or destroyed, in its original form and condition. The purpose of such a proceeding is merely to have the certificate of title reproduced, after proper proceedings, in the same form it was in when its loss or destruction occurred. RA No. 26 specifies the requisites to be met for the trial court to acquire jurisdiction over a petition for reconstitution of a certificate of title. Failure to comply with any of these jurisdictional requirements for a petition for reconstitution renders the proceedings null and void. Thus, in obtaining a new title in lieu of the lost or destroyed one, RA No. 26 laid down procedures which must be strictly followed in view of the danger that reconstitution could be the source of anomalous titles or unscrupulously availed of as an easy substitute for original registration of title proceedings[50].

Sections 2[51] and 3[52] of Republic Act No. 26 identify the sources for reconstitution of title. Section 2 enumerates the sources for reconstitution of original certificates of title while transfer certificates of title may be reconstituted from the sources recognized under Section 3. The petition in the case at bar falls under Section 3 (f) so the requirements under Sections 12 and 13 of RA No. 26 applies[53]. These sections prescribe the jurisdictional and procedural requirements of petitions for reconstitution of titles filed on the basis of documents other than the owner's duplicate certificate of title[54]. Section 12[55] of RA No. 26 describes the requirements for a petition for reconstitution while Section 13 thereof prescribes the requirements for a notice of hearing of the petition thus:

Sec. 13. The court shall cause a notice of the petition, filed under the preceding section, to be published, at the expense of the petitioner, twice in successive issues of the Official Gazette, and to be posted on the main entrance of the provincial building and of the municipal building of the municipality or city in which the land is situated, at least thirty days prior to the date of hearing. The court shall likewise cause a copy of the notice to be sent, by registered mail or otherwise, at the expense of the petitioner, to every person named therein whose address is known, at least thirty days prior to the date of the hearing. Said notice shall state, among other things, the number of the lost or destroyed certificate of title, if known, the name of the registered owner, the names of the occupants or persons in possession of the property, the owners of the adjoining properties and all other interested parties, the location area and boundaries of the property, and the date on which all persons having any interest therein must appear and file their claim or objections to the petition. The petitioner shall, at the hearing, submit proof of the publication, posting and service of the notice as directed by the court. (Underscoring supplied)

As may be noted, Section 13 specifically enumerates the manner of notifying interested parties of the petition for reconstitution. The notification process being mandatory, non-compliance with publication and posting requirements would be fatal to the jurisdiction of the reconstituting trial court and invalidates the whole reconstitution proceedings. Publication is a jurisdictional requirement and non-compliance therewith is fatal to the petition for reconstitution of title. The non-observance of the requirement invalidates the whole reconstitution proceedings in the trial court[56].

In the case at bar, the registered owner, LDRC, was not among the parties to which the order of hearing was sent despite being named as the party in whose name the lot was registered[57]. This defect constitutes non-compliance with the requirements set out under the law. In the case of *Castillo vs. Republic*[58], where the name of a registered co-owner was not stated in the notice of hearing, the Supreme Court ruled:

The trial court's 4 October 2002 Order was indeed posted in the places mentioned in Section 13, and published twice in successive issues of the Official Gazette: Volume 99, Number 2 dated 13 January 2003 and Volume 99, Number 3 dated 20 January 2003. The last issue was released by the National Printing Office on 21 January 2003. The notice, however, did not state Felisa as a registered co-owner. Neither did the notice identify Fernando's siblings Emma and Elpidio as interested parties.

The non-compliance with the requirements prescribed in Sections 12 and 13 of R.A. No. 26 is fatal. Hence, the

trial court did not acquire jurisdiction over the petition for reconstitution. We cannot stress enough that our jurisprudence is replete with rulings regarding the mandatory character of the requirements of R.A. No. 26. As early as 1982, we ruled:

Republic Act No. 26 entitled "An act providing a special procedure for the reconstitution of Torrens Certificates of Title lost or destroyed" approved on September 25, 1946 confers jurisdiction or authority to the Court of First Instance to hear and decide petitions for judicial reconstitution. The Act specifically provides the special requirements and mode of procedure that must be followed before the court can properly act, assume and acquire jurisdiction or authority over the petition and grant the reconstitution prayed for. These requirements and procedure are mandatory. The Petition for Reconstitution must allege certain specific jurisdictional facts; the notice of hearing must be published in the Official Gazette and posted in particular places and the same sent or notified to specified persons. Sections 12 and 13 of the Act provide specifically the mandatory requirements and procedure to be followed.

We cannot simply dismiss these defects as "technical." Liberal construction of the Rules of Court does not apply to land registration cases. Indeed, to further underscore the mandatory character of these jurisdictional requirements, the Rules of Court do not apply to land registration cases. In all cases where the authority of the courts to proceed is conferred by a statute, and when the manner of obtaining jurisdiction is prescribed by a statute, the mode of proceeding is mandatory, and must be strictly complied with, or the proceeding will be utterly void. When the trial court lacks jurisdiction to take cognizance of a case, it lacks authority over the whole case and all its aspects. All the proceedings before the trial court, including its order granting the petition for reconstitution, are void for lack of jurisdiction. (citations omitted)

GSIS claims that "there was neither an allegation nor evidence proffered to indicate that the lost TCT was in (sic) registered in the name of LRDC.[59]" This is not correct.

Contrarily, GSIS averred in its Petition, that:

xxx

- The said parcel of land is duly registered in the name of LAGRO Development and Realty Corporation and was assigned to herein petitioner GSIS under a Deed of Absolute Sale with Assignment [DASA], copy of which is attached hereto as Annex "A". Herein petitioner, in turn, sold the same on installment basis to spouses CARMEN V. RAEL and EDILBERTO K. RAEL under a Deed of Conditional Sale [DCS], attached as Annex "B.[60]"

xxx (Emphasis ours)

Moreover, a reading of the Deed[61] of Absolute Sale with Assignment and Deed[62] of Conditional Sale offered by GSIS as evidence reveals that LDRC is the registered owner of the parcel of land covered by TCT No. 183751. We cannot allow GSIS to discount a fact which itself caused to be entered into the records.

We reiterate that trial courts must exercise extreme caution in granting petitions for reconstitution, lest they become unwitting accomplices in the reconstitution of questionable titles instead of being instruments in promoting the stability of our land registration system[63]. The reconstitution of a certificate of title denotes restoration in the original form and condition of a lost or destroyed instrument attesting the title of a person to a piece of land. The purpose of the reconstitution of title is to have, after observing the procedures prescribed by law, the title reproduced in exactly the same way it has been when the loss or destruction occurred[64]. The courts must thus be cautious and careful in granting reconstitution of lost or destroyed certificates of title, both original and duplicate owner's copies, based on documents and decrees made to appear authentic from mere xerox copies and certifications of officials supposedly signed with seals of their office affixed thereon, considering the ease and facility with which documents are made to appear as official and authentic. It is the duty of the courts to scrutinize

and verify carefully all supporting documents, deeds and certifications. Each and every fact, circumstance or incident which corroborates or relates to the existence and loss of the title should be examined[65].

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the appeal is GRANTED. The Decision dated September 5, 2011 of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 87, Quezon City, in LRC Case No. Q-20496(05) is REVERSED and SET ASIDE. The Petition for Reconstitution filed by the Government Service Insurance System is DISMISSED.

SO ORDERED.

CERTIFICATION

Pursuant to Article VIII, Section 13 of the Constitution, it is hereby certified that the conclusions in the above decision were reached in consultation before the case was assigned to the writer of the opinion of the Court.

Dicdican, I.P, Chairperson and [*]Antonio-Valenzuela, N.G., JJ., concur.

[*] Vice Justice Michael P. Elbinias per Raffle dated May 23, 2014.

[1] Record, pp. 247-3.

[2] Rollo, pp. 1-6 (exclusive of annexes).

[3] Record, pp. 18-21.

[4] Record, p. 32.

[5] Record, pp. 35-7.

[6] Record, p. 43.

[7] Record, pp. 45-8.

[8] Record, p. 78.

[9] Record, pp. 82-4.

[10] An Act Providing A Special Procedure For The Reconstitution of Torrens Certificates of Title Lost of Destroyed.

[11] Record, pp. 85-7.

[12] Record, p. 91.

[13] Record, p. 93.

[14] Transcript of Stenographic Notes (TSN), August 14, 2008, Record, pp, 98-124.

[15] Record, pp. 136-8.

[16] Record, pp. 141-2.

[17] Record, p.

[18] Record, p.152.

[19] Record, pp. 165-6.

[20] Record, pp. 167-9.

[21] Record, pp. 170-1.

[22] TSN, March 11, 2011, Record, pp. 177-86.

[23] See Record, pp. 188-5.

[24] Record, pp. 205-7.

[25] Record, pp. 208-15.

[26] Record, pp. 49-54.

[27] Record, pp. 55-7.

[28] Record, pp. 58-9.

[29] Record, p. 60.

[30] Record, p. 61.

[31] Record, pp. 62-3.

[32] Record, p. 64.

[33] Record, p. 65.

[34] Record, p. 66.

[35] Record, p. 67.

[36] Record, p. 68.

[37] Record, p. 69.

[38] Record, pp. 70-1.

[39] Record, pp. 141-2.

[40] Record, p. 244.

[41] Record, p. 246.

[42] Record, pp. 247-53.

[43] Record, pp. 251-2.

[44] Record, pp. 261-2.

[45] Rollo, p. 24.

[46] Rollo, pp. 25-6.

[47] Rollo, p. 27.

[48] An Act Allowing Administrative Reconstitution of Original Copies of Certificates of Titles Lost or Destroyed Due to Fire, Flood and Other Force Majeure, Amending for the Purpose Section One Hundred Ten of Presidential Decree Numbered Fifteen Twenty-Nine and Section Five of Republic Act Numbered Twenty-Six.

[49] *Angat vs. Republic*, G.R. No. 175788, June 30, 2009.

[50] *Republic vs. Camacho*, G.R. No. 185604, June 13, 2013.

[51] Section 2. Original Certificates of Title shall be reconstituted from such of the sources hereunder enumerated as may be available, in the following order:

- (a) The owner's duplicate of the certificate of title;
- (b) The co-owner's, mortgagee's, or lessee's duplicate of the certificate of title;
- (c) A certified copy of the certificate of title, previously issued by the register of deeds or by a legal custodian thereof;
- (d) An authenticated copy of the decree of registration or patent, as the case may be, pursuant to which the original certificate of title was issued;
- (e) A document, on file in the registry of deeds, by which the property, the description of which is given in said document, is mortgaged, leased or encumbered, or an authenticated copy of said document showing that its original had been registered; and
- (f) Any other document which, in the judgment of the court, is sufficient and proper basis for reconstituting the lost or destroyed certificate of title.

[52] Sec. 3. Transfer certificates of title shall be reconstituted from such of the sources hereunder enumerated as may be available, in the following order:

- (a) The owner's duplicate of the certificate of title;
- (b) The co-owner's, mortgagee's, or lessee's duplicate of the certificate of title;
- (c) A certified copy of the certificate of title, previously issued by the register of deeds or by a legal custodian thereof;
- (d) The deed of transfer or other document, on file in the registry of deeds, containing the description of the property, or an authenticated copy thereof, showing that its original had been registered, and pursuant to which the lost or destroyed transfer certificate of title was issued;
- (e) A document, on file in the registry of deeds, by which the property, the description of which is given in said document, is mortgaged, leased or encumbered, or an authenticated copy of said document showing that its original had been registered; and
- (f) Any other document which, in the judgment of the court, is sufficient and proper basis for reconstituting the lost or destroyed certificate of title.

[53] *Republic vs. Domingo*, G.R. No. 197315, October 10, 2012.

[54] *Subido vs. Republic*, G.R. No. 152149, April 25, 2006.

[55] Sec. 12. Petitions for reconstitution from sources enumerated in Sections 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), 2(f), 3(c), 3(d), and/or 3(f) of this Act, shall be filed with the proper Court of First Instance, by the registered owner, his assigns, or any person having an interest in the property. The petition shall state or contain, among other things, the following: (a) that the owner's duplicate of the certificate of title had been lost or destroyed; (b) that no co-owner's, mortgagee's, or lessee's duplicate had been issued, or, if any had been issued, the same had been lost or destroyed; (c) the location and boundaries of the property; (d) the nature and description of the building or

improvements, if any, which do not belong to the owner of the land, and the names and addresses of the owners of such buildings or improvements; (e) the names and addresses of the occupants or persons in possession of the property, of the owners of the adjoining properties and of all persons who may have any interest in the property; (f) a detailed description of the encumbrances, if any, affecting the property; and (g) a statement that no deeds or other instruments affecting the property have been presented for registration, or if there be any, the registration thereof has not been accomplished, as yet. All the documents, or authenticated copies thereof, to be introduced in evidence in support to the petition for reconstitution shall be attached thereto and filed with the same: Provided, That in case the reconstitution is to be made exclusively from sources enumerated in Section 2(f) or 3(f) of this Act, the petition shall be further accompanied with a plan and technical description of the property duly approved by the Chief of the General Land Registration office (now Commission of Land Registration) or with a certified copy of the description taken from a prior certificate of title covering the same property.

[56] See *Heirs of Navarro vs. Go*, G.R. No. 176441, June 17, 2008.

[57] Record, pp. 18-21.

[58] G.R. No. 182980, June 22, 2011.

[59] Rollo, p. 67.

[61] Record, p. 2.

[62] Record, p. 61.

[63] Record, pp. 62-3.

[64] *Republic vs. Heirs of Ramos*, G.R. No. 169481, February 22, 2010.

[64] *Republic vs. Vergel De Dios*, G.R. No. 170459, February 9, 2011.

[65] *Republic vs. Lagramada*, G.R. No. 150741, June 12, 2008, citing *Tahanan Development Corporation vs. Court of Appeals*, G.R. No. L-55771, November 15, 1982.

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.