

RICHARD T. TABANAO, PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT, VS. ROBERTA A. YOSHIMINE, DEFENDANT-APPELLEE.

Ponente: LLOREN, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/0f942923a579/>

LLOREN, J.:

This is an appeal from the Order[1] dated August 15, 2012 of the Regional Trial Court of Cagayan de Oro City, 10th Judicial Region, Branch 19 in FC Civil Case No. 2010-064. The dispositive portion of which reads as follows:

“THE FOREGOING CONSIDERED, and taking into account that Petitioner is not the aggrieved party but had himself entered into two marriages, he has no locus standi to file this instant petition and for which the same is hereby ordered DIMISSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.”[2]

The facts as culled from the records:

On November 23, 1988, appellant Richard T. Tabanao married Imelda A. Taban-ud.[3] On March 19, 2001, during the subsistence of the first marriage, appellant married appellee Roberta A. Yoshimine.[4]

On October 12, 2010, appellant filed with the RTC of Cagayan de Oro City, Branch 19, a Petition for Declaration of Absolute Nullity of his second marriage which was docketed as FC Civil Case No. 2010-064[5]. He alleged that his second marriage is merely simulated as there was no marriage license issued to them and there was no actual marriage ceremony that took place.[6] He avers that the simulated marriage was done upon the insistence and insinuation of the relatives of the appellee that he would find a job in Japan as appellee is of Japanese descent.[7]

On August 15, 2012, the RTC rendered an Order[8] dismissing the petition, the dispositive portion of which was quoted at the outset.

The appellant appealed[9] the RTC decision and raised the following as errors:

THE HONORABLE COURT A QUO ERRED IN DISMISSING THE INSTANT CASE WHEN IT DECLARED THAT HEREIN PETITIONER-APPELLANT IS THE GUILTY PARTY;

THE HONORABLE COURT A QUO ERRED IN FAILING TO CONSIDER THE OTHER GROUNDS RELIED UPON BY PETITIONER-APPELLANT IN FILING THIS INSTANT PETITION.[10]

The Ruling of this Court

The appellant assails the RTC’s dismissal of his Petition for Declaration of Absolute Nullity of Marriage on the ground that he has no locus standi to file the instant petition. Appellant cites *Carlos v. Sandoval*,[11] and *Niñal v. Bayadog*[12] as authorities on the subject.[13]

The foregoing cases are not on all fours with the case at bar. In *Carlos v. Sandoval*[14], the Supreme Court does

not only require that the petition for declaration of absolute nullity of marriage be filed by the husband or wife but qualifies that the husband or wife who files the petition must be the aggrieved or injured party. In the present case, appellant is not the injured or aggrieved party as he was the one who entered into a second bigamous marriage. In *Carlos v. Sandoval*[15], Supreme Court ruled in this wise:

Under the Rule on Declaration of Absolute Nullity of Void Marriages and Annulment of Voidable Marriages, the petition for declaration of absolute nullity of marriage may not be filed by any party outside of the marriage. The Rule made it exclusively a right of the spouses by stating:

SEC. 2. Petition for declaration of absolute nullity of void marriages. –

(a) Who may file. – A petition for declaration of absolute nullity of void marriage may be filed solely by the husband or the wife.

Section 2(a) of the Rule makes it the sole right of the husband or the wife to file a petition for declaration of absolute nullity of void marriage. The rationale of the Rule is enlightening, viz.:

Only an aggrieved or injured spouse may file a petition for annulment of voidable marriages or declaration of absolute nullity of void marriages. Such petition cannot be filed by compulsory or intestate heirs of the spouses or by the State. The Committee is of the belief that they do not have a legal right to file the petition. Compulsory or intestate heirs have only inchoate rights prior to the death of their predecessor, and, hence, can only question the validity of the marriage of the spouses upon the death of a spouse in a proceeding for the settlement of the estate of the deceased spouse filed in the regular courts. On the other hand, the concern of the State is to preserve marriage and not to seek its dissolution. (Underscoring supplied)

While in the case of *Ninal v. Bayadog*[16], the Supreme Court allowed the petitioners to file a petition for the declaration of nullity of their father's marriage to therein respondent after the death of their father. However, We cannot apply its ruling in the present case for the reason that the impugned marriage therein was solemnized prior to the effectivity of the Family Code. The Supreme Court in *Niñal* recognized that the applicable law to determine the validity of the two marriages involved therein is the Civil Code, which was the law in effect at the time of their celebration.

What we have before us belongs to a different milieu. The marriage sought to be declared void by the appellant was entered into during the effectivity of the Family Code. As can be gleaned from the facts, appellant's marriage to Yoshimine was celebrated in 2001, after the effectivity of the Family Code and thus covered by the Rule on Declaration of Absolute Nullity of Void Marriages and Annulment of Voidable Marriages which took effect on March 15, 2003.

As enunciated in Section 2(a) of the Rule on Declaration of Absolute Nullity of Void Marriages and Annulment of Voidable Marriages, the same does not only require that the petition for declaration of absolute nullity of marriage be filed by the husband or wife but also qualifies that the husband or wife who files the petition must be the aggrieved or injured party. In the present case, the appellant is not the aggrieved or injured party as he was the one who entered into a second marriage.

Anent the second issue, appellant contends that the trial court erred when it failed to consider the other grounds relied upon by the appellant in filing the petition. Appellant claims that the instant case is not filed solely on the ground of bigamous marriage but mainly on the ground that there was actually no second marriage that ever took place.[17]

The argument is bereft of merit.

Parties to the marriage should not be permitted to judge for themselves its nullity, for the same must be submitted

to the judgment of competent courts and only when the nullity of the marriage is so declared can it be held as void, and so long as there is no such declaration the presumption is that the marriage exists.[18]

In this case, at the time the appellant contracted the second marriage with the appellee, the first marriage was still subsisting as it had not yet been legally dissolved. Appellant is reminded in *Jarillo v. People*,^[19] the Supreme Court affirmed the accused's conviction for bigamy, ruling that the moment the accused contracted a second marriage without the previous one having been judicially declared null and void, the crime of bigamy was already consummated because at the time of the celebration of the second marriage, the accused's first marriage which had not yet been declared null and void by a court of competent jurisdiction was deemed valid and subsisting.^[20] To hold otherwise would render the State's penal laws on bigamy completely nugatory, and allow individuals to deliberately ensure that each marital contract be flawed in some manner, and to thus escape the consequences of contracting multiple marriages, while beguiling throngs of hapless women with the promise of futurity and commitment.^[21] [Emphasis supplied]

WHEREFORE, the Order dated August 15, 2012 of the Regional Trial Court of Cagayan de Oro City, 10th Judicial Region, Branch 19 in FC Civil Case No. 2010-064 in AFFIRMED in toto.

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.

Jacob and Contreras, JJ., concur.

[1] RTC Order penned by Judge Evelyn Gamotin Nery, Records, pp. 101-102.

[2] Records, p.102.

[3] Id., p. 83.

[4] Id., p. 84.

[5] Records, p. 4-8.

[6] Id., p. 5.

[7] Id.

[8] See footnote no. 1.

[9] Records, p. 104.

[10] Rollo, p. 13.

[11] G.R. No. 179922, December 16, 2008.

[12] G.R. No. 133778, March 14, 2000.

[13] Rollo, pp. 22-25.

[14] See footnote no. 11.

[15] Id.

[16] G.R. No. 133778, March 14, 2000.

[17] Rollo, p. 26.

[18] Montanez v. Cipriano, G.R. No. 181089, October 22, 2012.

[19] G.R. No. 164435, September 29, 2009.

[20] Id.

[21] Tenebro v. CA, G.R. No. 150758, February 18, 2004.

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.