

**MELBA DELA CRUZ, REPRESENTED BY HER ATTORNEY-IN-FACT,
ANNABELLE C. SALLAO, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. SPOUSES ALLAN
AND JEMMA REYES, DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS.**

Ponente: DICDICAN, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/3ead1e1033e0/>

DICDICAN, J.:

Before us is an appeal from the Decision[1] that was rendered by Judge Consuelo Amog-Bocar of Branch 71 of the Regional Trial Court of the Third Judicial Region in Iba, Zambales (“trial court”) on January 20, 2014 in Civil Case No. RTC-3026-I which, inter alia, ordered herein defendants-appellants to vacate the property which was the subject matter of the instant case and surrender the possession thereof in favor of the plaintiff-appellee (“assailed decision”).

The material and relevant facts of the case, as culled from the record, are as follows:

The instant case stemmed from a Complaint[2] for recovery of possession and ownership that was filed by herein plaintiff-appellee Melba Dela Cruz (“plaintiff-appellee”) against herein defendants-appellants Spouses Allan and Jemma Reyes (“defendants-appellants”) in the trial court on July 29, 2010. In the said complaint, the plaintiff-appellee alleged that she was the true and lawful owner of a parcel of land located at Barangay Apo-Apo, Cabangan, Zambales, with an area of Ten Thousand Nine Hundred Eighty Six (10,986) square meters and covered by Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. 044-2010000030[3] (“subject property”). According to the plaintiff-appellee, she acquired the subject property from its previous owners, the heirs of Cleto Tadeo, by virtue of an Extrajudicial Settlement of Estate Among Heirs with Absolute Sale[4] dated October 21, 2009 whereby the heirs of Cleto Tadeo sold the subject property to herein plaintiff-appellee for the sum of One Hundred Seventy Thousand Pesos (Php170,000.00).

Nonetheless, the plaintiff-appellee averred that herein defendants-appellants had been occupying the subject property by mere tolerance of its previous owners. Thus, as the new owner of the subject property, the plaintiff-appellee requested the defendants-appellants to peacefully vacate the said property and surrender the possession thereof to the plaintiff-appellee.[5] The defendants-appellants, however, refused despite oral and written demands from the plaintiff-appellee for them to do so. The matter was likewise brought to the barangay for conciliation but the parties also failed to reach an amicable settlement on the matter.[6]

The foregoing antecedents thereby prompted the plaintiff-appellee to file the instant case in the trial court. In the said complaint, the plaintiff-appellee prayed that the trial court order the defendants-appellants to vacate and peacefully surrender the subject property in her favor. Moreover, the plaintiff-appellee prayed that the defendants-appellants be directed by the trial court to remove the structures which they had illegally built on the subject property.

Summons[7] was thereafter served upon the defendants-appellants requiring the latter to file their answer to the complaint within fifteen (15) days from their receipt thereof. Thus, in their Answer[8] to the complaint that was filed against them, the defendants-appellants argued that the plaintiff-appellee did not acquire the subject property

from the original heirs of Cleto Tadeo, namely: Demetria, Nemesio, Ernesto, Frifilo, Felomina and Carmen, all surnamed Tadeo. According to the defendants-appellants, the heirs of Cleto Tadeo were merely represented by Nemesio Tadeo and there was no partition yet among the aforesaid heirs as regards the subject property.

Thus, the defendants-appellants maintained that the contract of sale that was entered into between the heirs of Nemesio Tadeo and herein plaintiff-appellee was void in that the former had no right to sell the subject property without the consent of the other heirs of Cleto Tadeo. The defendants-appellants insisted that, as one of the great-grandchildren of Cleto Tadeo, they had the right to possess the subject property and that their possession thereof was not by mere tolerance.

A Pre-trial[9] was then conducted by the trial court whereby both parties entered into stipulations of facts and submitted the issues for the resolution of the trial court. Trial on the merits of the case ensued thereafter.

During the trial of the case, the plaintiff-appellee adduced in evidence the testimonies of Annabelle Sallao, Elizabeth Dela Cruz Badar and Lourdes Jane Cudal. Annabelle Sallao (“Sallao”) averred that she was the daughter of herein plaintiff-appellee and that the latter bought the subject property from the heirs of Cleto Tadeo by virtue of an extrajudicial settlement of estate with sale that was entered into between the parties. According to Sallao, the subject property was now declared for taxation purposes under the name of her mother who, since then, had been paying the real estate taxes due on the subject property.

Another witness for the plaintiff-appellee, Elizabeth Dela Cruz Badar (“Badar”) likewise alleged that she was the daughter of herein plaintiff-appellee. Badar narrated that the subject property was first mortgaged by Demetria Viernes, the daughter of Cleto Tadeo, to Anacleto Domingo (“Domingo”) and it was herein plaintiff-appellee who redeemed the subject property from Domingo.

Thereafter, Badar maintained that the heirs of Cleto Tadeo entered into a Deed of Mortgage[10] with the plaintiff-appellee whereby the former, as mortgagees, conveyed the subject property in favor of the plaintiff-appellee, the mortgagor, in consideration of a loan that was obtained by the heirs of Cleto Tadeo from her in the sum of One Hundred Fifty Thousand Pesos (Php150,000.00).

Subsequently, however, the heirs of Cleto Tadeo failed to pay their loan obligation to the plaintiff-appellee. Thus, the parties then entered into a deed of sale whereby the subject property was sold by the heirs of Cleto Tadeo to the plaintiff-appellee for the amount of One Hundred Seventy Thousand Pesos (Php170,000.00).

The last witness for the plaintiff-appellee, Lourdes Jane Cudal (“Cudal”), was the Land Registration Examiner and Officer-in-Charge of the Register of Deeds of Zambales. Cudal brought and identified in open court OCT No. T-4982 (in the name of Cleto Tadeo) and TCT No. 044-2010000030 which was registered in the name of the plaintiff-appellee. According to Cudal, in order to transfer the land title to the subject property in her name, the plaintiff-appellee presented in the Register of Deeds the deed of extrajudicial settlement, realty tax clearance, transfer tax receipt, tax declaration, affidavit of publication of the extrajudicial settlement, affidavit of non-tenancy and the DAR clearance. Moreover, Cudal stated that no one filed an adverse claim over the subject property as shown by the record of the Register of Deeds of Zambales.

For their part, the defendants-appellants presented in evidence the testimonies of defendant-appellant Allan Reyes himself, Eduardo Viernes, Violeta Viernes Reyes and Lina Racoma. Defendant-appellant Reyes claimed that he was the grandson of Demetria Tadeo who, in turn, was one of the children of Cleto Tadeo. He asserted that he was not aware of the existence of the extrajudicial settlement of estate that was purportedly executed by him and one Racquel Tadeo. Nonetheless, he admitted that a portion of the subject property, which was a rice land, was previously mortgaged to their neighbor Trining Domingo. However, he stressed that he was not aware that the

same rice land had been subsequently mortgaged to herein plaintiff-appellee.

Thereafter, witness Eduardo Viernes (“Viernes”), a grandson of Cleto Tadeo, testified that a portion of the subject property was, indeed, mortgaged to Trinidad and Anacleto Domingo. Moreover, Viernes claimed that it was only in the year 2012 when he came to know that the subject property had already been sold to the plaintiff-appellee. However, Viernes insisted that the aforesaid sale was without the consent of the other heirs of his grandfather Cleto Tadeo.

The two (2) other witnesses for the defendants-appellants, Violeta Viernes Reyes and Lina Racoma merely corroborated the testimonies of defendant-appellant Reyes and Viernes, particularly their allegation that the subject property was sold to herein plaintiff-appellee without the consent of all the heirs of Cleto Tadeo.

On January 20, 2014, the trial court rendered the assailed decision the dispositive portion of which reads:

“WHEREFORE, premises considered, judgment is hereby rendered in favor of the plaintiff and the defendants are ordered:

“1. To vacate and surrender the land that they occupy;

“2. To recognize plaintiff's ownership over the entire property covered by TCT No. 044- 2010000030;

“3. To remove all their improvements at their sole expense; and

“4. To pay the cost of this suit.

“SO ORDERED.”

Undaunted by the foregoing disquisition of the trial court, the defendants-appellants filed their appeal in this Court raising the following errors which were purportedly committed by the trial court, to wit:

I.

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN DECLARING THE PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE AS THE OWNER OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY.

II.

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN ORDERING THE DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS TO VACATE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY DESPITE PROOF THAT IT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE SALE.

III.

THE TRIAL COURT GRAVELY ERRED IN GIVING CREDENCE TO THE VOID EXTRAJUDICIAL SETTLEMENT OF ESTATE WITH DEED OF SALE WHEN SOME OF THE HEIRS OF CLETO TADEO WERE EXCLUDED THEREFROM.

In sum, the sole issue brought before this Court for resolution is whether or not the trial court committed an error when it ruled that the plaintiff-appellee was entitled to the possession and ownership of the subject property to the exclusion of herein defendants-appellants. After a careful and thorough review of the facts, law and issues of this case, we find the appeal that was filed by the defendants-appellants to be bereft of merit.

Settled is the age-old but familiar rule that he or she who alleges must prove his or her allegation. The burden of proof is on the part of the party who makes the allegations— *ei incumbit probatio, qui dicit, non qui negat*[11]. If a party claims a right granted by law, he or she must prove his or her claim by competent evidence, relying on the strength of his or her own evidence and not upon the weakness of that of his or her opponent[12]. A party alleging a critical fact must support his or her allegation with substantial evidence[13]. Substantial evidence has been defined as such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion[14].

Corollary thereto, Article 434 of the Civil Code governs an action for reconveyance. Thus:

Art. 434. In an action to recover, the property must be identified, and the plaintiff must rely on the strength of his title and not on the weakness of the defendant's claim.

Clearly, under Article 434 of the Civil Code, in order to successfully maintain an action to recover the ownership of a real property, the person who claims a better right to it must prove two (2) things: first, the identity of the land claimed and, second, his or her title thereto.[15] With regard to the first requisite, in an accion reivindicatoria, the person who claims that he or she has a better right to the property must first fix the identity of the land he or she is claiming by describing the location, area and boundaries thereof. Anent the second requisite, i.e., the claimant's title over the disputed area, the rule is that a party can claim a right of ownership only over the parcel of land that was the object of the deed.

As applied in the instant case, it is clear that the plaintiff-appellee had sufficiently proven that she owned the subject property and that she was entitled to the possession thereof. The land title to the subject property stating the metes and bounds of the same is clearly in the name of the plaintiff-appellee. The said land title is considered as an incontrovertible proof of ownership of the property that is described therein.[16] Settled is the rule in our jurisdiction that a Torrens title is evidence of indefeasible title to property in favor of the person in whose name the title appears. It is conclusive evidence with respect to the ownership of the land described therein.[17]

Moreover, there is no doubt that the plaintiff-appellee possessed a valid land title covering the subject property. It was likewise proven during the trial of the case that the plaintiff-appellee had acquired the said property from the heirs of Cleto Tadeo by virtue of a deed of extrajudicial settlement of estate with sale. In fact, one of her witnesses during the trial of the case was no less than the Officer-in-Charge of the Register of Deeds of Zambales who confirmed the genuineness and validity of the land title in her name. Moreover, the same witness declared that all the requisite documents were presented by the plaintiff-appellee in their office which facilitated the transfer of the land title in her name.

On the other hand, the defendants-appellants were not able to present any evidence which would belie the claim of the plaintiff-appellee. Apart from their self-serving statements, the witnesses for the defendants-appellants failed to adduce any evidence that would show that they were entitled to the possession and ownership of the subject property.

At this point, it must be stressed that, in civil cases, the party having the burden of proof must establish his case by a preponderance of evidence. Preponderance of evidence is the weight, credit, and value of the aggregate evidence on either side, and is usually considered to be synonymous with the term greater weight of the evidence or greater weight of the credible evidence. Preponderance of evidence is a phrase that means, in the last analysis, probability of the truth. It is evidence that is more convincing to the court as worthy of belief than that which is offered in opposition thereto.[18]

All told, this Court agrees with the finding of the trial court that the plaintiff-appellee had sufficiently proven her claim by preponderance of evidence. The pieces of evidence on record were sufficient to prove that the plaintiff-appellee was entitled to the possession and ownership of the subject property to the exclusion of herein defendants-appellants.

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing premises, judgment is hereby rendered by us DENYING the appeal that was filed by the defendants-appellants for lack of merit. The Decision rendered by Branch 71 of the Regional Trial Court of the Third Judicial Region in Iba, Zambales on January 20, 2014 in Civil Case No. RTC-3026-I is AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

Ybañez, and Paredes, JJ., concur.

[1] Record, Civil Case No. RTC-3026-I, pages 277-287.

[2] Ibid, pages 2-5.

[3] Ibid, Exhibit “C”, pages 7-9.

[4] Ibid, Exhibit “B”, pages 11-12.

[5] Ibid, Exhibit “E”, page 14.

[6] Ibid, Exhibit “F”, page 13.

[7] Ibid, page 17.

[8] Ibid, pages 26-29.

[9] Ibid, pages 42-44.

[10] Ibid, pages 140-142.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid.

[13] UST Faculty Union v. University of Santo Tomas, G.R. No. 180892, April 7, 2009.

[14] Standard Chartered Bank Employees Union (NUBE) v. Confessor, G.R. No. 114974, June 16, 2004.

[15] Hutchinson v. Buscas, 498 Phil. 257, 262, 2005.

[16] Heirs of Leopoldo Vencilao, Sr. v. Court of Appeals, 351 Phil. 815.

[17] Urieta v. Alfaro, G.R. No. 164402, July 5, 2010.

[18] Oño, et al. v. Lim, G.R. No. 154270, March 9, 2010.

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.