

WALTER BALASABAS, PETITIONER, VS. HON. CIPRIANO VAMENTA, JR., AS PRESIDING JUDGE, BRANCH III, CFI OF NEGROS ORIENTAL; GENOVEVA GONZALES, ALICIA GONZALES, IGNACIO GONZALES, EL VIR...

G.R. No. L-46459. January 31, 1979

Ponente: SANTOS, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/526d0fc4ea13/>

SANTOS, J.:

By this petition for certiorari filed on July 11, 1977, petitioner seeks to set aside the orders of respondent Judge Cipriano Vamenta Jr. of Negros Occidental - (1) dated March 25, 1977, granting a Writ of Preliminary Mandatory Injunction, ordering herein petitioner to restore to private respondents the possession of the land in question and to maintain the status quo; restraining petitioner from harvesting and milling sugarcane, and from further committing acts of dispossession, upon respondents filing a bond in the sum of Five Thousand Pesos (P5,000); and (2) the order of May 19, 1977, which denied herein petitioners' "Motion for Reconsideration" of the said order - which were issued in Civil Case No. 6469 for Specific Performance With Preliminary Mandatory Injunction, entitled "Genoveva Gonzales, et al vs. Walter Balasabas, et al.," on the grounds that respondent Judge acted with grave abuse of discretion and there is no appeal or any plain, speedy and adequate remedy available to petitioner (Rollo, pp. 2-17).

On July 21, 1977, We resolved, without giving due course to petition, to require respondents to file their comments. Private respondents filed their comment, after extension, on September 12, 1977; respondent Judge reiterated the reasons and grounds stated in his Order sought to be set aside and adopted the comments of private respondent as his own (Rollo, pp. 78-87).

On January 18, 1978 after pleadings have been filed - including the parties' respective memoranda - private respondents, thru counsel, manifested that on October 20, 1977, they filed a Manifestation before respondent court to the effect that in spite of the Order dated March 25, 1977 subject of the petition respondents . . . "have not actually taken possession of the land in question and do not intend to do so" . . . "that they . . . have no objection to petitioner's taking possession of the property in question"; and ". . . there is no more legal obstacle in petitioner's taking possession of the land in question to enable him to cultivate it during the pendency of the main case in the court a quo." (Rollo, pp. 101-103.)

The said Manifestation filed in the Court a quo, in extenso, follows:

X X X

"Plaintiffs, by counsel, respectfully manifest that although per Order of this Honorable Court dated March 25, 1977, defendants have been ordered, among others, to restore plaintiffs to the possession of the land in question the latter have not actually taken physical possession of the same and do not intend to do so, considering that they have abandoned plans of cultivating the area for sugarcane purposes in view of adverse economic conditions affecting the sugar industry. This manifestation is made to inform this Honorable Court

and defendants that plaintiff would have no objection to defendants' taking possession of the property in question, the aforesaid Order of the Court notwithstanding." (Emphasis supplied; Rollo, p. 104).

Petitioner, however, insists that the issues raised in the petition ". . . regardless of the non-interest of the respondents to occupy the land in question . . ." should be resolved because private respondents may take "again another inconsistent stand between now and the time this petition is restored." (Rollo, p. 106; Petitioner's Memorandum With Reply to Memorandum of Respondents).

This petition should be dismissed. For with the foregoing manifestation formally filed in the Court a quo this petition to set aside the order of March 25, 1977 has become moot and academic. Respondent Judge, on the strength of the same, should have set aside the said order and the "Writ of Preliminary Mandatory Injunction" issued on 29 March 1977, and if he has not done so, is hereby directed to do so, and proceed with the determination of the merits of the case filed with his Court. This petition has ceased to be a contentious interlocutory incident in the main action before respondent Judge.

WHEREFORE, the Court resolved to dismiss, as it hereby DISMISSES, this petition is moot and academic.

SO ORDERED.

Fernando, (Chairman), Barredo, Antonio, Aquino, and Concepcion, Jr., JJ., concur.

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.