

**IN RE: APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION OF ORIGINAL
REGISTRATION OF TITLE, HEIRS OF URBANO CALUMA,
APPLICANTS-APPELLANTS, VS. SAINT LOUIS REALTY
CORPORATION, OPPOSITOR-APPELLANT.**

Ponente: PAREDES, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/2ae9a11ea679/>

PAREDES, J.:

THE CASE

THIS IS ON THE APPEAL filed by both applicants Heirs of Urbano Caluma (Heirs of Caluma) and oppositor Saint Louis Realty Corporation (SLRC) from the Order[1] dated February 23, 2004 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 160, Pasig City (San Juan Station), in LRC Case No. N-4405, dismissing, without prejudice, the applications for original registration of title; and the Order[2] dated March 8, 2011, denying the motions for reconsideration.

THE ANTECEDENTS

On December 6, 1963, Urbano Caluma (Urbano), claiming to be the owner in fee simple of a parcel of land situated in the Municipality of Antipolo, Rizal, covering an area of 695,860 square meters, more or less (the subject property), filed an Application for Original Registration[3] before the Court of First Instance, Branch VI, Rizal. The case was docketed as LRC Case No. N-4405 (LRC Rec. No. N-25262).

On July 10, 1990, SLRC filed a Motion[4] for substitution of Applicant on the ground that it had purchased the subject property from Urbano by virtue of a Deed of Absolute Sale dated March 26, 1963, which sale was allegedly sustained by the decision dated December 18, 1968 of the RTC, Pasig, in Civil Case No. 10160, and affirmed by this Court in G.R. No. L-43780-R dated January 24, 1977.

In the Order[5] dated November 13, 1990, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 (the court then handling the case) denied the Motion for Substitution of SLRC on a finding that the purported decision in Civil Case No. 10160 was only for the award of damages, not for the sale of the subject property, and that there is no showing that the said decision had been executed.

On November 15, 1990, due to the death of applicant Urbano Caluma on August 31, 1990, and due to the case having been archived on October 25, 1977, the Heirs of Caluma filed a Motion[6] for revival, continuance and substitution of Applicant by his compulsory heirs.

On November 26, 1990, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 granted[7] the Motion and ordered the revival of LRC Case No. N-4405 and the continuation of the hearing with the Heirs of Caluma as substitute applicants. Thereafter, hearing ensued.

On July 19, 1991, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 rendered a Decision[8], the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, the requisite of possession and occupation of the parcel of land in question as provided for in Commonwealth Act No. 141 (b) as amended, having been satisfied, the Court hereby confirms applicant's title to the same and order its registration in his name.

Upon the order becoming final and executory, let an order for the issuance of the decree be issued.

SO ORDERED.

On August 16, 1991, the Republic of the Philippines, through the Office of the Solicitor General (OSG), filed a motion for reconsideration[9] on the following grounds, that: (1) it was not furnished a copy of applicant's formal offer of evidence; (2) it was not notified of the hearing on February 18, 1991; (3) the decision did not pass upon the opposition filed in 1964; (4) the decision was based on an incomplete record of the case; and (5) private oppositors were not notified of the reactivation of the application.

On February 19, 1993, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 issued an Order[10] granting the motion for reconsideration of the OSG and setting the case for further reception of evidence in order to allow the Republic and private oppositors the opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses of the applicant and present evidence in their behalf.

Silverio G. Perez, the Director of the Department of Registration, Land Registration Authority (LRA) submitted to Pasig RTC-Branch 153, a Report[11] dated March 10, 1994, informing the court of his finding that portions of plan Psu-198433 were subjects of registration in other cases or records. He recommended that: (a) the Regional Technical Director, Land Management Sector, Region IV, Manila, be ordered to verify the information that the property overlapped with other surveys and submit the result of their findings to the Honorable Court and to the LRA; (b) the applicant to submit an amended plan of Psu-198433 together with the corresponding technical description duly verified and approved by the Regional Technical Director by excluding therefrom as separate lots the portion covered by the decreed properties; and (c) CENRO, Antipolo, Rizal to submit a report on the status of the following surveys if covered by land patents, to wit: (1) Psu-206397, Lot 2; (2) Psu-208805; (3) Psu-199438, Lots 1-4; (4) Psu-212482, Lot 1; (5) Psu-196701, Lot 2; (6) Psu-199692; and (7) FV-12507, Lot 3.

Pursuant to the said Report, the Heirs of Caluma were ordered[12] to amend the application and/or relocate the areas applied for, so as to exclude the portions covered by the decreed properties.

On November 29, 1994, the Heirs of Caluma filed their Compliance/Manifestation[13] averring that they had caused the approval of plan Psu-197833, as amended, dated November 4, 1994 and praying that the decision dated July 19, 1991 be amended accordingly, and reiterate the immediate issuance of the decree of registration in the name of the (substituted) applicants.

On December 7, 1994, Pasig RTC-Branch 153, issued an Order[14] ruling thus:

WHEREFORE, the decision of this Court of July 19, 1991 is amended reducing the areas applied for to 676,673 square meters (Lot 4, Psu-198433 Amd.) so as to exclude the conflicted areas.

The Land Registration Authority is hereby ordered to issue a decree of registration to the areas applied for above, in the names of the substituted applicants.

SO ORDERED.

In the Supplemental Report[15] dated August 14, 1995, Artemio Legaspi, Acting Director of the Department of Registration of the LRA, reported that when the amended plan was plotted in their Municipal Index Sheet thru its tie line, discrepancies were again noted and were referred to the Regional Director, Lands Management Sector, Region IV, Manila, through the letter dated February 28, 1995, for verification and correction.

In view of the supplemental report, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 issued an Order[16] on August 28, 1995, directing: (a)

the Regional Technical Director of the Lands Management Sector of Region IV to verify the information cited in the letter dated February 28, 1995 of the LRA and to submit the result of his/her findings to the RTC and the LRA within 15 days from receipt; (b) the applicant to submit another amended plan of Psu-198433 Amd. together with the corresponding technical description duly verified and approved by the Regional Technical Director by excluding therefrom as separate lots the remaining portions covered by decreed properties within 30 days from receipt.

On February 19, 1998, the Heirs of Caluma and the Director of the Department of Registration of the LRA submitted a Compliance with Joint Manifestation[17] alleging that, as of February 8, 1998, plan Psu-198433, amd., was completed and approved as requested by the LRA to the Regional Director of the Bureau of Lands, Region IV. The approved amended plan[18] and the technical descriptions[19] of the lots were submitted to Pasig RTC-Branch 153.

In the Omnibus Order[20] dated January 29, 1999, the Heirs of Caluma were directed to show proof that they have complied with the jurisdictional requirement of publication pursuant to Section 19, PD 1529, in order to vest jurisdiction upon the court to pass upon the merits of the case.

The LRA then filed a Motion[21] to dispense with republication considering that the area applied for had decreased by 19,187 square meters from the original area applied for of 695,860 square meters, to 676,673 square meters, but that discrepancies still existed with respect to lots “K”, “N”, and “R”, the discrepancies noted having been brought to the attention of the Regional Technical Director, Land Management Sector [now, Bureau (LMB)], Region IV, Manila. The Motion was subsequently granted in the Order[22] dated January 18, 2000, but holding the approval of the amended plan and technical description in abeyance, pending the verification/correction of the discrepancies.

On August 18, 2000, the Heirs of Caluma filed a Motion[23] for Issuance of final Decree of Registration, praying that the LRA be directed to issue a final decree of registration covering lot “A”, with an area of 269,694 square meters, since there was no more discrepancy with respect to the said lot.

In the Omnibus Order[24] dated May 8, 2001, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 disposed of the pending incidents as follows:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, action upon:

- The motion of the applicant for the issuance of a final decree of registration on Lot A of Plan Psu-198433 Amd.2, shall follow only after a new decision is rendered. For being issued without the required notice to the interested parties and compliance of accurate technical requirements regarding discrepancies and overlapping, the Order of December 7, 1994 is set aside. As this Court cannot render a conclusive and credible decision on an [sic] incomplete records, the applicant and/or the Heirs of Urbano Caluma are ordered to cause the reconstitution and/or furnished [sic] the Court with the complete records specifically the original copy of the application of LRC Case No. 4405 and up to July 4, 1990[,] within sixty (60) days from notice. The Court will thereafter issue appropriate Orders for purposes of reception of applicant's evidence where the interested parties will be given their day in Court, specifically the Solicitor General.
- The Petition for Relief from Judgment and the Motion of the Adverse-Claimants to Transfer Venue are all DENIED; and

- The Manifestation with Motion of St. Louise Realty Corporation to take judicial notice of the Decision of the Court of Appeals in G.R. No. 43780, the Deed of Absolute Sale dated March 26, 1963 and Deed of Quitclaim dated September 17, 1964 is GRANTED. At [the] appropriate time, the Court pursuant to Section 29 of Republic Act No. 496 as Amended by PD 1529 will require the St. Louis Realty Corporation to present the original or certified true copies of the instruments which they intend to support their claims.

SO ORDERED.

Thereafter, the Heirs of Caluma filed a Motion[25] for Inhibition and/or Disqualification of Judge Briccio C. Ygaña; the motion was found to be a mere scrap of paper for failure of notice to the other parties and for having been filed by counsel for applicants Heirs of Caluma, Atty. Lauro Tapucar, who was disbarred on July 30, 1998; thus, the motion was merely noted in the Order[26] dated June 18, 2001. On July 5, 2001, Atty. Lauro Tapucar reiterated[27] his motion for the inhibition of Judge Ygaña through a “Respectful Comment”.

On July 30, 2001, applicants Heirs of Caluma, through “collaborating counsel” Atty. Frederick G. Dedace, filed a Compliance[28], attaching a certified true copy of the Application for Original Registration[29] and a Certified True Copy of Plan Psu-198433[30].

Acting on the “Respectful Comment” and Compliance filed by the Heirs of Caluma, Pasig RTC-Branch 153 issued an Order[31] dated August 31, 2001, found that even with the documents attached to the Compliance, the records were still incomplete as all documents/pleadings filed prior to the April 4, 1990 motion of SLRC are not available, such as the various pleadings of the public and private oppositors, and the Order of General Default; and that necessary documents had not been complied with, hence, not submitted, namely: (1) compliance by the Director of Forestry to the Report of Antonio Noblejas, LRA Commissioner, dated March 13, 1964, requiring the said director to submit a report on the status of the land applied for to determine whether or not the subject property or any portion thereof is covered by any patent or forest zone; (2) recommendations of Silverio Perez in the Report dated March 10, 1994; and (3) verification and correction by the Regional Director of the lots overlapping with another survey, not conforming with Plan Psu-198433, amd., and with incomplete tie line. The Compliance was not a full and complete submission; and the “Respectful Comment” reiterating the motion for inhibition, is granted; thus:

WHEREFORE, let the entire records of this case including exhibits and transcript of stenographic notes be remanded to the Office of the Clerk of Court of the Regional Trial Court of Pasig City for proper disposition.

SO ORDERED.

On October 15, 2001, the case was raffled to Pasig RTC-Branch 160[32].

In the Order[33] dated January 9, 2003, the RTC directed the Heirs of Caluma to comply with the Order dated May 8, 2001 while, in the Order[34] dated January 23, 2003, the RTC ordered the Heirs of Caluma and SLRC to comment on the memorandum filed by the OSG.

On June 19, 2003, the OSG filed a Motion[35] to dismiss due to the failure of the Heirs of Caluma to comply with the Orders dated May 8, 2001, January 9, 2003 and January 23, 2003 and for failure to appear at the hearing on June 5, 2003, despite due notice and for no justifiable cause.

SLRC filed its Comment[36] opposing the said motion and praying that it be declared to be substituted as the rightful applicant in the instant case. The Heirs of Caluma also filed an Opposition[37] claiming that the documents which were required to be submitted were already part of the records.

On February 23, 2004, the RTC issued the assailed Order[38] disposing the case as follows:

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, the instant case is hereby ordered DISMISSED without prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

The Heirs of Caluma and SLRC filed separate Motions for reconsideration which were, however, denied in the Order[39] dated March 8, 2011.

ISSUE

Whether or not the RTC erred in dismissing the application for registration of title of the subject property.

THE COURT'S RULING

The appeal is without merit.

While, admittedly, there was only partial compliance of the documents and papers required from them, the Heirs of Caluma insist that it was not their fault and there was justifiable cause for the delay. According to them, the required documents were not within their control and/or possession as all, if not a majority of said documents, are in the custody of and will emanate from different government agencies[40]; thereby praying for liberality and relaxation of the Rules so as not to prejudice their rights[41].

The application[42] for original registration, docketed as LRC Case No. N-4405, was filed by Urbano Caluma on December 6, 1963. No further action was taken by the applicant, or the CFI, for the publication of, and hearing on, the application. On July 10, 1990, or roughly 27 years after the filing of the application for original registration in 1963, the SLRC filed a motion for substitution of applicant in LRC Case No. N-4405; the motion was denied on November 13, 1990. The motion of SLRC is the first pleading in the records of LRC Case No. N-4405. Thereafter, the chronology of succeeding events of record, were:

A. Before Pasig RTC-Branch 153

- (1) November 15, 1990 – Heirs of Caluma file motion for revival, continuance and substitution of applicant;
- (2) November 26, 1990 – Order granting motion of heirs of Caluma. Hearings held on the application;
- (3) July 19, 1991 – Decision confirming (original) applicant's title over the subject property covering an area of 695,860 square meters;
- (4) August 16, 1991 – OSG files motion for reconsideration of Decision dated July 19, 1991;
- (5) February 19, 1993 – Order granting the motion of the OSG; Decision dated July 19, 1991 reconsidered; OSG, representing the Republic, and private oppositors allowed to cross-examine witnesses and re-assess documents submitted by heirs of Caluma;
- (6) March 10, 1994 – Report submitted by Silverio G. Perez, Director, Department of Registration, LRA, recommending that: (a) the Regional Technical Director, Land Management Sector, Region IV, Manila, be ordered to verify the information that the property overlapped with other surveys and submit the result of their findings to the Honorable Court and to the LRA; (b) the applicant to submit an amended plan of Psu-198433 together with the corresponding technical description duly verified and approved by the Regional Technical Director by excluding therefrom as separate lots the portion covered by the decreed properties; and (c) CENRO, Antipolo, Rizal to submit a report on the status of the following surveys if covered by land patents, to wit: (1) Psu-206397, Lot 2; (2) Psu-208805; (3) Psu-199438, Lots 1-4; (4) Psu-212482, Lot 1; (5) Psu-196701, Lot 2; (6) Psu-199692; and (7) FV-12507, Lot 3 (LRA Perez Report);
- (7) August 12, 1994 – Order directing heirs of Caluma to amend the application and/or relocate the areas

applied for, so as to exclude portions covered by the decreed properties;

(8) November 29, 1994 – Heirs of Caluma file Compliance/Manifestation claiming that Plan Psu-197833 as amended, has been approved;

(9) December 7, 1994 – Order amending Decision dated July 19, 1991 by reducing the area covered to 676,673 square meters (Lot 4, Psu-198433);

(10) August 14, 1995 – Supplemental Report submitted by Artemio Legaspi, Actg. Dir., Dept. of Registration, LRA, recommended that Regional Director, Lands Management Sector, Region IV, Manila, be directed to verify and correct the discrepancies noted (LRA Legaspi Supplemental Report);

(11) August 28, 1994 – Order directing the: (a) Regional Director, to comply with the LRA Legaspi Supplemental Report; and (b) applicant to submit another amended Plan Psu-198433 as approved and verified by the Regional Director;

(12) February 19, 1998 – Compliance and Joint Manifestation of heirs of Caluma and LRA Director for Registration, submit an approved amend Plan Psu-198433 and technical description of lots;

(13) January 29, 1999 – Omnibus Order directing heirs to show proof of publication of the application;

(14) October 6, 1999 – LRA files motion to dispense with republication considering that the area applied for had decreased by 19,187 square meters from the original area applied for of 695,860 square meters, to 676,673 square meters, but that discrepancies still existed with respect to lots “K”, “N”, and “R”, the discrepancies noted having been brought to the attention of the Regional Technical Director, Land Management Sector [now, Bureau (LMB)], Region IV, Manila;

(15) January 18, 2000 – Order granting the LRA motion to dispense with the republication, but holding the approval of the amended plan and technical description in abeyance pending the verification/ correction of the discrepancies;

(16) May 8, 2001 – Omnibus Order clarifying that the: (a) July 19, 1991 Decision had been set aside; (b) December 7, 1994 Order is not an Amended Decision, and was set aside as it was issued without notice to oppositors and without due process; and directing the heirs of Caluma and SLRC to submit their basic documents for completion of records and notify public and private oppositors;

(17) July 30, 2001 – Heirs of Caluma file Compliance, attaching certified true copies of the application for original registration filed by Urbano Caluma and certified true copy of Plan Psu-198433; and

(18) August 31, 2001 – Compliance filed was not complete, as various pleadings of oppositors and order of general default, were not submitted; no report from Director of Forestry, DENR on report of LRA Commissioner Noblejas regarding status of land; no report on LRA Director Perez Report; and no report from LMB Regional Director regarding overlapping survey lots and incomplete tie lines. Pasig RTC-Branch 153 Judge Ygaña inhibited himself.

B. Before Pasig RTC-Branch 160

(1) January 9, 2003 – Order directing heirs of Caluma to comply with the Order dated May 8, 2000;

(2) June 13, 2003 – OSG files motion to dismiss for failure of applicant heirs of Caluma to comply with the May 8, 2000 Order, and for their and SLRC's failure to appear at the scheduled hearing on June 5, 2003;

(3) July 1, 2003 – SLRC files Comment to OSG's motion to dismiss;

(4) November 19, 2003 – Heirs of Caluma file their Comment to OG's motion to dismiss; and

(5) February 23, 2004 – Order dismissing application of heirs of Caluma and of SLRC, without prejudice; and

(6) March 8, 2011 – Order denying the motions for reconsideration.

As gleaned from the above, this 1963 LRC case had been dragging on for more than half a century and still, the applicants had not completely submitted the required documents to sustain and bolster their application for original registration. If, at the outset, the applicant had submitted the documents required under the law for original registration, complied with the publication requirement, and secured the issuance of notices to the government and the adjoining owners, the case could have been terminated at a much earlier date and to their satisfaction. The delay occasioned in the resolution of this case can only be ascribed to applicants, and to none other. Although the correction, verification and approval of discrepancies, overlapping of boundary lines and incomplete tie lines lay with government agencies, the applicants-heirs of Caluma, as the party who would benefit from the compliance of the concerned government agencies, should have exerted due diligence in securing these documents; and the fact that these were not submitted speaks of their failure to exert due diligence; hence, the heirs of Caluma must bear the consequences for their failure to comply with the orders of the RTC.

According to the heirs of Caluma, publication was duly made and compliance with all the jurisdictional requirements were met. Furthermore, they claim that no oppositor was present during the formal announcement of the application in the initial hearing.[43] However, We cannot confirm these allegations in the absence of the records of the proceedings from 1963, when the application was filed, until 1977, when the case was archived. The available records of the case in possession of the Court only begins with the Motion for Substitution of Applicant filed by SLRC on July 10, 1990.[44]

Moreover, the required report from the Director of Forestry on whether the land subject of application for registration is comprised in any patent or forest zone was never submitted to the RTC. This should have been established from the very beginning since before the lot may be granted to an applicant, it must be declared alienable and disposable. Unfortunately, nowhere in the records does it show that the said report had been procured and submitted to the RTC.

Moreover, the heirs of Caluma must be able to present the precise technical description of the property being claimed since the plan they submitted appears to have overlapped with other properties decreed to other individuals or are subjects of pending land registration cases.

Thus, the RTC properly dismissed the case pursuant to Section 3, Rule 17 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure, which states:

SEC. 3. Dismissal due to fault of plaintiff.— If, for no justifiable cause, the plaintiff fails to appear on the date of the presentation of his evidence in chief on the complaint, or to prosecute his action for an unreasonable length of time, or to comply with these Rules or any order of the court, the complaint may be dismissed upon motion of defendant or upon the court's own motion, without prejudice to the right of the defendant to prosecute his counterclaim in the same or in a separate action. This dismissal shall have the effect of an adjudication upon the merits, unless otherwise declared by the court. (Emphasis supplied)

We are aware of the pronouncement of the Supreme Court that inconsiderate dismissals neither constitute a panacea nor a solution to the congestion of court dockets. While they lend a deceptive aura of efficiency to records of individual judges, they merely postpone the ultimate reckoning between the parties. In the absence of clear lack of merit or intention to delay, justice is better served by a brief continuance, trial on the merits, and final disposition of the cases before the court.[45] However, remanding the case to the lower court will only further delay the proceedings in the absence of the records of the case. Applicants will be in a better position if they procure and submit anew the necessary documents to prove their ownership of the subject property in a newly

filed case. They will just face a roadblock if they insist that the lower court rule on their application in the absence of the records of the proceedings.

Besides, the dismissal is without prejudice. If the Heirs of Caluma are indeed the owners of the property by virtue of their continuous and adverse possession, they can file another application and present the proper and sufficient evidence to prove their ownership and right over the property.

Lastly, SLRC claims that with the dismissal of the case, it will be denied due process since it will lose the chance or opportunity to present its documents for reasons not attributable to it.[46] It further insists that it be substituted as the lawful owner and possessor of the parcels of land subject of the controversy.[47] However, having found the dismissal proper, SLRC's motion for substitution is necessarily included in the same. Furthermore, to the mind of this Court, it will be more expeditious to refile the application since the problems which arose from the instant case causing further delays will no longer exist.

WHEREFORE, the appeal is DISMISSED. The Order dated February 23, 2004 and the Order dated March 8, 2011 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 160, Pasig City (San Juan Station) are hereby AFFIRMED.

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.

Didican, I.P., Chairperson, and [*]Antonio-Valenzuela, JJ., concur.

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

[1] Records, Vol. III, pp. 1213-8.

[2] Records, Vol. IV, pp. 261-3.

[3] Records, Vol. I, pp. 31-3.

[4] Id., pp. 1-3.

[5] Id., pp. 23-4.

[6] Id., pp. 25-6.

[7] See Order dated November 26, 1990. Id., p. 57.

[8] Id., pp. 116-9.

[9] Id., pp. 120-7.

[10] Id., p. 156.

[11] Id., pp. 177-9.

[12] Order dated August 12, 1994, Id., p. 183.

- [13] *Id.*, pp. 184-5.
- [14] *Id.*, pp. 188-9.
- [15] *Id.*, p. 209.
- [16] *Id.*, p. 213.
- [17] *Records*, Vol. II, pp. 464.
- [18] *Id.*, p. 487.
- [19] *Id.*, pp. 466-80.
- [20] *Id.*, pp. 713-8.
- [21] *Records*, Vol. III, pp. 818-9.
- [22] *Id.*, pp. 825-6.
- [23] *Id.*, pp. 888-9.
- [24] *Id.*, pp. 939-69.
- [25] *Id.*, pp. 970-1.
- [26] *Id.*, pp. 973-5.
- [27] *Id.*, pp. 977-8.
- [28] *Id.*, pp. 981-2.
- [29] *Id.*, pp. 984-7.
- [30] *Id.*, pp. 988-1005.
- [31] *Id.*, pp. 1006-11.
- [32] *Pasig OCC Notices of raffle*; *Id.*, pp. 1013-4.
- [33] *Id.*, p. 1147.
- [34] *Id.*, p. 1149.
- [35] *Id.*, pp. 1162-4.
- [36] *Id.*, pp. 1169-73.
- [37] *Id.*, pp. 1209-10.
- [38] *Id.*, pp. 1213-8.
- [39] *Records*, Vol. IV, pp. 261-3.
- [40] *Rollo*, pp. 66-7.
- [41] *Id.*, p. 69.
- [42] *Record*, Vol. III, pp. 984-1005, inclusive of attachments; *supra*, notes 30 and 31.
- [43] *Id.*, p. 60.

[44] See Omnibus Order dated May 8, 2001, *supra* note 24.

[45] *Tabuada v. Ruiz*, GR No. 168799, June 27, 2008.

[46] *Rollo*, p. 85.

[47] *Id.*, p. 86.

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.