

**FE B. ORENSE, REPRESENTED BY RENE H. IMPERIAL,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. SPS. PEDRO & PAZ SURTIDA,
DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS.**

Ponente: DIMAAMPAO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/206706499ec4/>

DIMAAMPAO, J.:

The Rules of Procedure are designed to ensure a fair, orderly and expeditious disposition of cases; however, the rules are not meant to allow hasty judgments at the price of great injustice. Where a strict and unflinching reliance on technical rules will defeat their real objective, and where the non-observance thereof is neither deliberate nor with intent to cause any undue delay by a party, a liberal construction of these rules would be becoming, if not compelling, at times.[1]

The foregoing legal aphorism finds application in the case at bench.

Repugned in this Appeal is the Decision[2] dated 29 October 2012 of the Regional Trial Court, Fifth Judicial Region, Legazpi City, Branch 1, in Civil Case No. 11068, for Recovery of Possession, the decretal portion of which reads:

“WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, the court hereby renders judgment:

1. Directing the defendants or any person or persons acting under them to vacate and turn over the physical possession to the plaintiff or her representative the real property described as follows subject matter of the Contract to Sell; and,
2. Condemning the defendants to be jointly and severally liable to pay and/or reimburse to the plaintiff the total sum of P170,000.00 in attorney's fees, the same to earn interest, pursuant to *Eastern Shipping Lines, Inc. v. Court of Appeals*, at the rate of 6% per annum from February 18, 2012 and 12% per annum on the amounts due from the finality of this judgment until its satisfaction.

SO ORDERED.”[3]

The salient facts are not in dispute. The legal strife between the parties has its provenance in a Complaint for Recovery of Possession[4] lodged by plaintiff-appellee Fe Orense (appellee), represented by Rene Imperial, against defendants-appellants the spouses Pedro and Paz Surtida (appellants). After appellants filed their Answer, the case was initially scheduled for a pre-trial conference on 2 July 2012.[5] This was rescheduled to 17 July 2012,[6] 28 August 2012,[7] and 19 September 2012[8] as the parties manifested that they were in the process of settling their dispute. On the last scheduled date for pre-trial conference, appellants and their counsel were not present, prompting the court a quo to allow appellee to present her evidence ex parte.[9] Ploughing through the evidence proffered by appellee, the court a quo rendered the challenged Decision.

Appellants moved for reconsideration but the court a quo unfavorably acted on their Motion.[10]

Through the present recourse, appellants raise the following errors—

I

THE DECISION OF THE HONORABLE TRIAL COURT DATED OCTOBER 29, 2012 AND ITS ORDER DATED NOVEMBER 19, 2012 IS (SIC) CONTRARY TO FACTS AND TO LAW.

II

THE HONORABLE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN RENDERING THE JUDGMENT EXCLUSIVELY BASED ON PLAINTIFF'S EVIDENCE WITHOUT FIRST GOING THRU THE MANDATORY MEDIATION CONFERENCE. ALSO IN VIOLATION OF ART. 2030 OF THE CIVIL CODE AND IN VIOLATION OF SEC. 6 OF RULE 1 OF THE REVISED RULES OF COURT.

The Appeal is meritorious.

The factual milieu obtaining here merits a reversal of the court a quo's judgment based on an ex parte evidence.

Case law teaches Us that the Court should afford party-litigants the amplest opportunity to enable them to have their cases justly determined, free from constraints of technicalities. Technicalities should take a backseat against substantive rights and should give way to the realities of the situation. The better and more prudent course of action in a judicial proceeding is to hear both sides and decide the case on the merits instead of disposing the case by technicalities. What should guide judicial action is the principle that a party-litigant is to be given the fullest opportunity to establish the merits of his complaint or defense rather than for him to lose life, liberty or property on technicalities. The ends of justice and fairness would best be served if the issues involved in the case are threshed out in a full-blown trial. Trial courts are reminded to exert efforts to resolve the matters before them on the merits and to adjudge them accordingly to the satisfaction of the parties, lest in hastening the proceedings, they further delay the resolution of the cases.[11]

It is beyond cavil that appellants were present in all the scheduled pre-trial conferences, except for the last one set on 19 September 2012. This single instance of non-appearance, which was beyond their and that of their counsel's control, neither amounts to willful disregard of the orders of the court nor warrants the disallowance of appellants' right to present their evidence. Nothing on record would demonstrate that appellants had manifested lack of interest to defend their right or delay the proceedings. Appellants having shown no culpable negligence in not attending the scheduled pre-trial, the court a quo should not have so anxiously wielded its power to deny their right to pre-trial and present evidence to controvert appellee's claim. Jurisprudence dictates that unless the conduct of the party is so negligent, irresponsible, contumacious, or dilatory as for non-appearance to provide substantial grounds for dismissal, the courts should consider lesser sanctions which would still achieve the desired end.[12] It should be stressed that pre-trial conference is primarily for the purposes of exploring the possibility of a compromise, or on the failure thereof, for the parties to make certain admissions and stipulations in order to facilitate a more efficient proceeding at the trial proper.[13]

Au contraire, it is discernible that appellants were ready and zestful to defend their case. In actual fact, they were present on the previous scheduled pre-trial conference. Further, upon receipt of the Order allowing appellee to present evidence ex parte, appellants immediately filed their Motion for Reconsideration and adequately explained their non-appearance. Under such factual ambience, the court a quo should have granted appellants' Motion and allowed them to adduce their evidence. Besides, it was not shown that a remand of the case for trial for purposes of allowing appellants to present their evidence would cause undue prejudice to appellee. Perforce, it is judicious for the court a quo to accord both appellee and appellants a chance to litigate their causes fairly and openly, without resort to technicality. Unless the reopening of the case is clearly intended for delay, courts should be liberal in setting aside orders barring defendants from presenting evidence. Judgments based on an ex parte presentation of evidence are generally frowned upon.[14] Needless to state, the ends of justice and fairness would

best be served if the issues involved in the case at bench are threshed out in a full-blown trial and both parties are given the opportunity to litigate their dispute and submit the merits of their respective positions.

WHEREFORE, the Appeal is hereby GRANTED. The Decision and Order dated 29 October 2012 and 19 November 2012, respectively, of the Regional Trial Court, Fifth Judicial Region, Legazpi City, Branch 1, in Civil Case No. 11068, are REVERSED AND SET ASIDE. The court a quo is DIRECTED to proceed with the pre-trial conference and trial on the merits, with celerity.

SO ORDERED.

Ybañez and Manahan, JJ., concur.

[1] Bahia Shipping Services, Inc. v. Mosquera, 423 SCRA 305 (23 February 2004).

[2] Original Records, pp. 69-74

[3] Original Records, pp. 73-74.

[4] Id., pp. 1-5.

[5] Id., pp. 26 & 33.

[6] Id., pp. 40-41.

[7] Id., p. 42.

[8] Id., pp. 46-47.

[9] Id., p. 47.

[10] Id., pp. 86-87.

[11] See Chan Kent v. Micarez, 645 SCRA 176, 185-186 (9 March 2011).

[12] See Real Bank, Inc. v. Samsung Mabuhay Corporation, 633 SCRA 124, 137 (13 October 2010).

[13] See Alcaraz v. Court of Appeals, 497 SCRA 75, 81-82 (28 July 2006).

[14] See Jonathan Landoil International Co., Inc. v. Mangudadatu, 436 SCRA 559, 571 (16 August 2004). (Emphasis Ours)

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.