

**JOSE CASARÍA AND MILAGROS MESTIDIO, PETITIONERS, VS.
RICARDO ROSALES, MERCEDES GLORIA, SPOUSES AND RAMON
BLANCO, IN HIS CAPACITY AS ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE COURT OF
AGRARIAN RELA...**

G.R. No. L-20288. June 22, 1965

Ponente: BENGZON, J.P., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/2174773fc0cf/>

BENGZON, J.P., J.:

A petition for liquidation of harvests and for ejectment, with prayer for an interlocutory order to deposit the palay from said harvests, was filed on September 15, 1960 in the Court of Agrarian Relations, 8th Regional District, Iloilo City, by Ricardo Rosales and Mercedes Gloria against Jose Casaría, Pablo Mercado and Elias Gimeno.

On September 19, 1960 the court issued an interlocutory order as prayed for. On October 14, 1960 Jose Casaría filed his answer, stating that while he worked and cultivated portions of the land in question, the Agrarian Court has no jurisdiction because no tenancy between him and Ricardo Rosales exists, stating 'll that the land he cultivated belongs to Milagros Mestidio.

An answer in intervention, admitted by the court upon motion therefor, was filed on February 8, 1961 by Milagros Mestidio, alleging that intervenor owns the land cultivated by Jose Casaría and praying that the Agrarian Court dismiss the case for lack of jurisdiction.

Ricardo Rosales, on August 8, 1961, filed his opposition attaching thereto affidavits supporting his ownership of the land.

By order of the court dated November 21, 1961, the Acting Clerk of Court made an ocular inspection of the land involved on December 1, 1961.

Specifically, the description of the land in question, per ocular report of the Acting Clerk of Court, is:

North—Gorgonio Gicole and Guinutos Creek

East —Guinobatan Creek

South—Juan Gicole and Ramon Gabasa

West—Quinarhayan Creek, Panay River and Guinutos Creek

Ricardo Rosales' tax declaration No. 7434 gives the same description:

North—Antonio Beldia vs. Gorgonio Gicole and Guinutos Creek

East —Guinobatan Creek

South—Juan Gicole and Ramon Gabasa

West —Quinarbayan Creek, Panay River and Guinutos Creek.

Intervenor Milagros Mestidio presented a deed of sale relating to land with different boundaries:

North—Virginia Gimeno

East—Demitria Gamus and Miguel Giménez

South—Juan Gicole

West —Ricardo Rosales

After trial, the Agrarian Court rendered its decision on April 7, 1962, declaring Ricardo Rosales and Mercedes Gloria as the landholders, ordering Jose Casaria to deal with them, dismissing the intervention of Milagros Mestidio, and ordering delivery of 25% of the amount of the Palay deposited as the share of Ricardo Rosales. Jose Casaria and Milagros Mestidio filed a motion for reconsideration which was denied on August 13, 1962. They have, therefore, appealed to this Court. On May 17, 1964, however, after the appeal was submitted for decision, Jose Casaria filed a manifestation withdrawing his appeal. Appellants' counsel opposed said manifestation, laying that the case be decided on the merits.

It is appellants' contention that the Agrarian Court has no jurisdiction over the case since, allegedly, ownership of the land is in issue. We have in many a case stated that whether the court has jurisdiction or not is determined by the allegations in the complaint or petition. (*Suanes vs. Almeda Lopez* 73 Phil. 573; *Campos Rueda Corp. vs. Bautista*, L-18453, September 29, 1963; *Abo vs. Philame [KG] Employees and Workers Union*, L-19912, January 30, 1965; *Tuvera vs. De Guzman*, L-20547, April 30, 1965).

The petition filed in this case before the Agrarian Court sets forth allegations for liquidation of harvests and ejectment of a tenant by the landholder, without putting ownership of the land in issue. It is the Agrarian Court, therefore, that has jurisdiction thereover. All cases involving the dispossession of a tenant by the landholder or the settlement and disposition of disputes arising from the relationship of landholder and tenant, fall under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of the Court of Agrarian Relations (Sec. 21, RA 1199, Sec. 7, RA 1267).

Since the Agrarian Court acquired jurisdiction, the same subsists even if in the answer the alleged landlord-tenant relationship is denied and ownership of the land is adversely interposed (*Mandih vs. Tablatin*, 107 Phil. 530, *Tuvera vs. De Guzman*, *supra*).

Furthermore, the record shows that the court a quo acted within its limited jurisdiction and did not adjudicate on the question of ownership or title to the land, merely passed upon the conflicting evidence of ownership for the purpose of determining who, as between the parties, is the landholder to whom the landholder's share in the produce should be delivered by the tenants. (*Tomacruz vs. Court of Agrarian Relations*, L-16542, May 31, 1961).

Since the court a quo's finding, that Ricardo Rosales and Mercedes Gloria are in fact the landholders of the 34-hectare land in question, is supported by substantial evidence, this Court will not disturb it on appeal (*Ulpindo vs. CAR*, 109 Phil., 964; *Tomacruz vs. CAR*, *supra*; *Toledo vs. CAR*, L-16054, July 31, 1963; Sec. 3, Rule 43, Rules of Court).

WHEREFORE, the decision appealed from is hereby affirmed with costs against appellants. It is so ordered.

Bengzon C.J., Bautista Angelo, Concepcion, Reyes, J.B.L., Paredes, Dizon, Regala, Makalintal and Zaldivar, JJ.,

concur.

Decision affirmed.

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.