

CARLOS MORAN SISON AND PRISCILA F. SISON, PETITIONERS, VS. COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE, RESPONDENT.*G.R. No. L-22480. October 04, 1971*

Ponente: DIZON, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/2bff31165813/>**DIZON, J.:**

Petitioners appealed from a resolution dated January 13, 1964 of the Court of Tax Appeals in its Case No. 337 (a) denying their petition for the rendition of a decision "on the merits" in said case, and instead, (b) granting herein respondent's motion for the execution of the judgment rendered by this Court in G. R. No. L-13739 entitled "The Commissioner of Internal Revenue vs. Carlos Moran Sison and Priscila F. Sison".

In our decision of June 30, 1971, We affirmed the aforesaid resolution of the Court of Tax Appeals, with costs.

Now before Us is petitioners' motion for the re-consideration of our decision, on the ground that the same is based on certain "misapprehension of facts". In the first place, they point to the statement made therein to the effect that they refrained from presenting evidence to prove the invalidity of the questioned deficiency tax, claiming that they did present both oral and documentary evidence on said matter; in the second place, they point to another statement made in the afore-said decision to the effect that petitioners contended that "upon the remanding of the case below, the Court of Tax Appeals was bound to set the case anew for hearing," claiming that they had never advanced such contention; and lastly, petitioners' claim that when in our decision in G. R. No. L-13739 We said that "the Collector's actuation is herein sustained," We did not thereby sustain the disputed assessment.

It must be admitted that there was inaccuracy in the first two statements, it appearing from the record that during the hearing below held on August 20, 1957, petitioners presented the testimony of Atty. Teodoro Dominguez and several documents as evidence, among them being those mentioned in petitioners' reply brief and their motion for reconsideration now under consideration. It is a fact, however, that in the course of said hearing Atty. Dominguez, while arguing on the question of prescription, said the following: "We prefer not to submit evidence in the meantime while waiting for the resolution of this Honorable Court" - obviously on the question of prescription that he had raised. Thereupon, Judge Nable made the observation that the Court was "trying the whole case on the question of prescription and on the merits", to which Atty. Dominguez replied: "As I had already pointed out, your Honor, the Collector of Internal Revenue....", but his statement was interrupted by an observation made by Judge Luciano to this effect: "It is up to you if you want to take that chance." (t.s.n., p. 9, August 20, 1957). The first "misapprehension of fact" must, therefore, be considered in the context of the foregoing.

The statement that petitioners had argued "that upon the remanding of the case below, the Court of Tax Appeals was bound to set the case anew for hearing" suffers likewise from inaccuracy. The statement should have been, instead, that it was petitioners' contention that upon the remanding of the case below the Court of Tax Appeals was called upon to render a decision "on the merits" in view of the fact that its decision, appealed to and later reversed by the Supreme Court, did not decide the question of the validity of the assessment but merely declared

that the same had prescribed. As a matter of fact, upon the remanding of the case below, petitioners filed on November 21, 1963 a PETITION FOR DECISION ON THE MERITS. This petition was denied by the Court of Tax Appeals in its resolution of January 13, 1964, which furthermore granted the motion for execution of judgment filed by the respondent Collector of Internal Revenue. Whatever inaccuracy there is in our statement regarding this particular matter may be traced to the fact that the personal recommendation made by the writer of the decision to the Court during its deliberation on the case was precisely to have it remanded below to enable petitioners to present whatever other evidence they had on the alleged invalidity of the questioned deficiency tax assessment. The recommendation, however, was disapproved by all the other members of the Court in whose opinion judgment should be rendered affirming the resolution of the Court of Tax Appeals which denied petitioners' petition for the rendition of a decision on the merits and, furthermore, ordering the execution of the final judgment rendered in G. R. No. L-13739.

Considering the questions raised by petitioners in their brief as appellants, namely, that "The Tax Court erred in granting appellee's motion for execution of the decision rendered by this Honorable Supreme Court on April 30, 1963 in G. R. No. L-13739, and denying appellants' petition for decision on the merits of C.T.A. Case No. 337," it is obvious that the "misapprehension of facts" above-referred to do not constitute reversible errors, nor do they show that our decision is erroneous. In fact, they do not adversely affect the following portion of our decision which, in reality, is the main ground in support thereof:

"Section 14 of Rep. Act 1125 which speaks of the "Effect of decision that tax is barred by Statute of Limitations," pro-vides that if the decision of the court is that the tax is barred said decision "shall be considered as its decision that there is no deficiency in respect of such tax." Such being the rule the contrary must like-wise be true, namely: that if the decision of the court is that the tax is not barred, such decision must be understood in the sense that there is deficiency in respect of such tax. In line with this, when in G.R. No. L-13739 We overruled therein appellee's claim for damages, We did so "not only be-cause they took no appeal from the decision presently under review, but also because the collectors' actuation is herein sustained." (Underlines supplied; Commissioner etc. vs. Sison, 7 SCRA pp. 884, 886). The collectors' contention involved in that case was pre-cisely that herein petitioners were liable for a deficiency tax in the amount of P5,535.02."

Petitioners contend, however, that the statement "the Collector's actuation is herein sustained" was only a "passing observation" in relation to their complaint that they had been harrassed and persecuted by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue with persistent and repeated re-investigations of their income tax liability; that, therefore, "The collector's action there sustained was appellee's actuation of causing the re-investigation of appellants' income tax liability for 1949 by differ-ent teams of revenue examiners during a period of more than four (4) years." Petitioners will thus limit the meaning and scope of our statement to the propriety or regularity of the repeated investigations complained of. This is an erroenous view. Our statement to the effect that "the Collector's actuation is herein sustained" necessarily implies approval not only of the repeated investigations he had made of petitioners' income tax liability, but also of the final result thereof, namely, his finding that petitioners were liable for the deficiency tax they were required to pay. Moreover, peti-tioners' defense of prescription referred to the defi-ciency tax amounting to P5,535.02 which the respondent Commissioner was trying to collect from them. When said defense was sustained by the Court of Tax Appeals, the claim barred was naturally the aforesaid deficiency tax; and when We reversed the decision of said Court, it is likewise crystal clear that what We held to be not yet prescribed was the same claim. The Court of Tax Appeals correctly understood our decision in G. R. No. L-13739 to have precisely this meaning, for which reason it refused to render another decision "on the merits"; and as our deci-sion aforesaid had become final and executory, it ordered its execution.

In view of the foregoing, discussion of the merits and probative value of the oral and documentary evidence mentioned in petitioners' reply brief and motion for re-consideration, is deemed unnecessary.

WHEREFORE, petitioners' motion for the reconsideration is hereby denied.

Concepcion, C.J., Reyes, J.B.L., Makalintal, Zaldivar, Castro, Teehankee, Barredo, Villamor, and Makasiar, JJ., concur.

Fernando, J., did not take part.

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.