

**RHEMA INTERNATIONAL LIVELIHOOD FOUNDATION, INC., REP. BY
MANUELITO D. TRAYA AND/OR ROSA TUBAY AND/OR BOY V.
HAUTEA, PROPERTY ADMINISTRATOR, PETITIONERS, VS. HON.
EVANGELINE C. C...**

Ponente: PERALTA, JR., E. B., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/3481a763973f/>

PERALTA, JR., E. B., J.:

Instead of addressing Our observations on September 13, 2013^[1] about procedural impediments to petitioners' remedy under Rule 65, the series of papers from movants thereafter did not dwell on what is ordinarily contemplated by acknowledged tenets in Rule 37 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure.

In lieu of a detailed discussion on possible defects concerning the procedural angle of the Decision, petitioners' Motion for Reconsideration focused on substantive provisions of the Civil Code.^[2] Necessarily, such sub rosa treatment from petitioners can hardly produce the desired result.

Accordingly, for lack of persuasive force, We hereby DENY petitioners' Motion for Reconsideration.

SO ORDERED.

[*] Gonzales-Sison, M., Chairperson, and [**]Bueser, D. Q., JJ., concur.

[*] Acting Chairperson, per Office Order No. 352-13-RSF dated September 11, 2013.

[**] Acting Senior Member, per Office No. 350-13-RSF dated September 10, 2013.

[1] Rollo, pp. 108-116.

[2] Motion for Reconsideration, pp. 2-4, Rollo, pp. 120-122; cf. 1 Regalado, Remedial Law Compendium, 10th edition, 2010, pp. 427-428, citing Section 2, Rule 37, Francisco vs. Caluag, L-15365, December 26, 1961, Villalon, et al. vs. Ysip, et al., 98 Phil. 851 and other cases; 2 Feria and Noche, Civil Procedure Annotated, 2013 edition, page 99 – “A motion for reconsideration must point out specifically the findings or conclusions of the judgment demonstrating the invoked ground; or are not supported by the evidence or which are contrary to law. There should be an express reference to the testimonial or documentary evidence or to the provisions of law alleged to be contrary to such findings and conclusions.” (citing Philippine Commercial and Industrial Bank vs. Ortiz, 150 SCRA 380, 391 [1987], Marikina Valley Development Corporation vs. Flojo, 251 SCRA 87, 93 [1995]).

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.