

BANGKO SENTRAL NG PILIPINAS, PETITIONER, VS. HON. ISMAEL T. DULDULAO, IN HIS CAPACITY AS PRESIDING JUDGE OF BRANCH 197 OF THE REGIONAL TRIAL COURT OF LAS PIÑAS CITY, THE EX-OFFI...

Ponente: LOPEZ, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/54bd44ece53e/>

LOPEZ, J.:

This petition for certiorari under Rule 65 of the Rules of Court assails: (1) the September 15, 2013 Order of the Regional Trial Court of Las Piñas City that denied the Motion to Dismiss filed by the Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP); and (2) the December 13, 2013 Order denying BSP's motion for reconsideration.

The facts are culled from the records.

In 2001, Filipino Vastland Company, Incorporated borrowed P349,500,000.00 from Banco Filipino Savings and Mortgage Bank, evidenced by promissory notes[1] and secured by a deed of mortgage that covered several parcels of land. One of the mortgaged property is a 29,862 square meter land located in Las Piñas City covered by TCT No. (69062) T-34857-A registered to BF Homes, Incorporated. BF Homes had previously authorized Filipino Vastland, through a Special Power of Attorney, to use the property as collateral for its loan with Banco Filipino.[2]

Sometime in April 2009, Banco Filipino obtained a thirty-day Emergency Loan from BSP pursuant to Monetary Board Resolution (MB Res.) No. 477.[3] Banco Filipino then executed a Promissory Note with Trust Receipt Agreement for P534,477,550.00 payable not beyond May 1, 2009, secured by Banco Filipino's past due loan receivables that were, in turn, secured by real estate mortgages.[4] Concurrently, a Deed of Assignment of Mortgage was executed wherein Banco Filipino assigned and indorsed several promissory notes and mortgages in favor of BSP, including the Filipino Vastland promissory notes and mortgages.[5] The Deed of Assignment of Mortgage authorized BSP to foreclose the properties originally mortgaged to Banco Filipino.[6]

Banco Filipino's Emergency Loan was renewed and extended several times[7], the last of which was executed on October 28, 2009 with a face value of P487,334,650.00 and a maturity date of November 27, 2009.[8] The Emergency Loan remained unpaid.[9]

On March 17, 2011, the Monetary Board issued MB Res. No. 372-A placing Banco Filipino under the receivership of Philippine Deposit Insurance Commission (PDIC). Consequently, BSP considered Banco Filipino as having defaulted on the Emergency Loan and started calling on the securities provided under the Promissory Note with Trust Receipt Agreement and the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage.

On March 21, 2011, the BSP's Department of Loans and Credit (DLC) sent a letter to Filipino Vastland demanding payment of the loans it acquired from Banco Filipino.[10] Filipino Vastland, through its treasurer Rosalina Tacolod, sent letters to the BSP on May 9, 2011 and June 7, 2011 asking for additional time to respond to the demand letter.[11] Meanwhile, on October 27, 2011, the Monetary Board issued MB Res. No. 1635 directing PDIC to proceed with the liquidation of Banco Filipino.[12]

On April 31, 2013, BSP filed an Application for Extrajudicial Foreclosure Sale of Real Estate Mortgage of the property covered by TCT No. (69062) T-34857-A with the Office of the Clerk of Court as Ex-Officio Sheriff for the Regional Trial Court of Las Piñas City.[13] A Notice of Extrajudicial Sale was issued on June 17, 2013, scheduling the public auction sale on July 24, 2013. BF Homes received the Notice of Extrajudicial Sale on July 9, 2013.[14]

On July 23, 2013, BF Homes, filed a Petition for Declaratory Relief and Prohibition before the Regional Trial Court of Las Piñas City, Branch 197 (RTC). BF Homes, with office address at PSCOR Building, J. Elizalde St., BF Homes, Parañaque City, impleaded: (1) BSP with office address at A. Mabini St., cor. P. Ocampo St., Malate, Manila; (2) Banco Filipino with office address at 101 Paseo de Roxas, Makati City which is now under receivership of PDIC located at SSS Building, Ayala Avenue corner V.A. Rufino St., 1226, Makati City; and (3) the Ex-Officio Sheriff-Regional Trial Court of Las Piñas City. BF Homes alleged that a pronouncement, by way of declaratory relief, should be made on the rights of BSP, as mortgagee, to initiate foreclosure proceedings against BF Homes. The property to be foreclosed was meant to secure the loan of Filipino Vastland and not Banco Filipino's Emergency Loan. The continuation of the foreclosure proceedings and issuance of certificate of sale will necessarily result in breach or violation of the mortgagor's rights.[15]

The public auction sale was conducted on July 24, 2013 and BSP emerged as the winning bidder.[16] The Certificate of Sale was issued on July 31, 2013[17] and subsequently annotated in TCT No. (69062) T-34857-A on October 29, 2013[18].

Meanwhile, on July 31, 2013, BSP filed a motion to dismiss BF Homes' petition, arguing that despite being designated as an action for declaratory relief, the petition is a real action affecting the title to and interests in the subject property. Since the docket fees paid did not correspond to the value of the subject property, the RTC did not acquire jurisdiction over the subject matter of the case. Even if the petition is not a real action, the venue which was filed at the address of a nominal party, i.e. the Ex-Officio Sheriff of Las Piñas City, is improperly laid. Assuming that the petition is one for declaratory relief, it is dismissible since: (1) the auction sale conducted on July 24, 2013 has rendered the petition moot and academic; (2) BF Homes is not a party in interest, not being a party to the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage; and (3) BF Homes is guilty of laches. Further, assuming that the petition can be treated as one for prohibition, it should be dismissed for failure to comply with the requirements of Section 2, Rule 65[19] in relation to Section 3, Rule 46[20] of the Rules of Court.

On September 15, 2013, the trial court issued an Order denying BSP's motion to dismiss, to wit:

In view thereof, the Motion to Dismiss of respondent BSP and that of respondent BFSMB are hereby both DENIED.

Accordingly, let summons be issued anew and served, together with a copy of the petition and its annexes, upon respondent BSP giving it a chance to file its answer to the petition within the period set therein.

SO ORDERED.[21]

BSP moved for reconsideration but it was denied.[22] Hence this petition for certiorari with prayer for the issuance of an injunctive writ, ascribing grave abuse of discretion upon the trial court for failing to dismiss BF Homes' petition.[23]

On March 13, 2014, We issued a Resolution holding the issuance of an injunctive writ in abeyance and ordering private respondent BF Homes to file its Comment.[24]

In its Comment, BF Homes insists that the petition is one for declaratory relief because it involves the determination of the respective rights of the parties under the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage. Also, declaratory

relief is a personal action and the venue is at the option of the plaintiff. The petition was properly filed in Las Piñas City since one of the respondents is the Ex-Officio Sheriff of the RTC of Las Piñas City. BF Homes further stressed that the petition cannot be dismissed for being moot and academic since it was filed before the foreclosure sale was conducted or before there was breach or violation to the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage.[25]

With the filing of BF Homes' Comment, the case is now considered ripe for decision.[26]

Stripped of non-essentials, the allegations of the parties precipitate two primary issues: (1) whether the petition filed by BF Homes before the RTC of Las Piñas City is one for declaratory relief; and (2) if so, whether the petition is dismissible.

Section 1, Rule 63 of the Rules of Court on Declaratory Relief provides:

Section 1. Who may file petition. - Any person interested under a deed, will, contract or other written instrument, whose rights are affected by a statute, executive order or regulation, ordinance or any other governmental regulation may, before breach or violation thereof, bring an action in the appropriate Regional Trial Court to determine any question of construction or validity arising, and for a declaration of his rights or duties, thereunder.

xxx

The requirements of an action for declaratory relief are as follows: (1) there must be a justiciable controversy; (2) the controversy must be between persons whose interests are adverse; (3) the party seeking declaratory relief must have a legal interest in the controversy; and (4) the issue involved must be ripe for judicial determination.[27] There is no dispute that the first, second and fourth requisites are present in this case. The BSP, however, claims that BF Homes is not a proper party for declaratory relief because it is not a signatory to the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage. We disagree.

Legal standing or locus standi has been defined as a personal and substantial interest in the case, such that the party has sustained or will sustain direct injury as a result of the challenged act.[28] Interest means a material interest in issue that is affected by the questioned act or instrument, as distinguished from a mere incidental interest in the question involved.[29] Here, We recall that the property foreclosed by BSP is covered by TCT No. (69062) T-34857-A in the name of BF Homes. As the registered owner of the property foreclosed, it is indisputable that BF Homes has a legal interest in the case.

That BF Homes is not a party to the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage does not negate its interest in the case. The Deed of Assignment of Mortgage is not the only contract under scrutiny. At the heart of this controversy is the Special Power of Attorney executed by BF Homes in favor of Filipino Vastland allowing it to use the subject property as collateral to its loan with Banco Filipino. As BF Homes alleged in its petition, the foreclosed property was meant to secure the loan of Filipino Vastland and not Banco Filipino's Emergency Loan. The rights acquired by BSP as mortgagee under the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage must therefore be reconciled with the provisions of the Power of Attorney, making BF Homes' legal interest indubitable.

Considering that the petition filed by BF Homes is one for declaratory relief, We find that it should be dismissed for improper venue. Both the BSP and BF Homes agree that declaratory relief is a personal action. Section 2, Rule 4 of the Rules of Court reads:

Sec. 2. Venue of personal actions. - All other actions may be commenced and tried where the plaintiff or any of the principal plaintiffs resides, or where the defendant or any of the principal defendants resides, or in case of a non-resident defendant where he may be found, at the election of the plaintiff. (Emphasis Ours)

Sec. 2 of Rule 4 indicates clearly that when there is more than one plaintiff in a personal action, the residences of the principal parties should be the basis for determining proper venue. The word “principal” has been added in order to prevent the plaintiff from choosing the residence of a minor plaintiff or defendant as the venue.[30] Eliminate the qualifying term “principal” and the purpose of the Rule would be defeated where a nominal or formal party is impleaded in the action since the latter would not have the degree of interest in the subject of the action which would warrant and entail the desirably active participation expected of litigants in a case.[31] The Ex-Officio Sheriff of the RTC of Las Piñas City is merely a nominal party. Hence, the petition for declaratory relief should have been filed where the principal parties are located, i.e. either at Parañaque City for BF Homes, at Manila for BSP, or at Makati City for Banco Filipino.

More importantly, the petition for declaratory relief can no longer prosper in light of the auction sale conducted on July 24, 2013, the issuance of the Certificate of Sale on July 31, 2013, and its annotation in TCT No. (69062) T-34857-A on October 29, 2013.[32] An action for declaratory relief presupposes that there has been no actual breach of the instruments involved or of the rights arising from them. A petition for declaratory relief gives a practical remedy for ending controversies that have not reached the state where another relief is immediately available; and supplies the need for a form of action that will set controversies at rest before they lead to a repudiation of obligations, an invasion of rights, and a commission of wrongs.[33] We note that BF Homes filed the petition on July 23, 2014, or one day before the auction sale was conducted. The petition was filed to determine the rights of BSP as a mortgagee with the purpose of preventing it from foreclosing and auctioning off the subject property. Considering that the act sought to be prevented by the petition has already occurred, the necessity of a declaratory relief is rendered futile. Thus, the petition must be dismissed.

Incidentally, We note that Section 6, Rule 63 of the Rules of Court allows a petition for declaratory relief to be converted into an ordinary action if before the termination of the case, a breach or violation of an instrument should take place.[34] In this case, however, We cannot apply the provisions of Section 6. BF Homes neither asked for the conversion of its petition for declaratory relief into an ordinary action nor did it specify the ordinary action it desired. The Court cannot reasonably assume that BF Homes now seeks either the annulment of the foreclosure sale or the annulment of the Deed of Assignment of Mortgages, or both.[35]

ACCORDINGLY, the petition for certiorari is GRANTED. The September 15, 2013 and December 13, 2013 Orders of the Regional Trial Court of Las Piñas City are SET ASIDE. The petition for declaratory relief filed by BF Homes, Incorporated is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to the filing of the appropriate ordinary action.

SO ORDERED.

Reyes, Jr., J.C., (Chairperson) and Inting, S.B., JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, pp. 525-534. The promissory notes are: (1) Promissory Note No. 08-28543-8-01 for P106,000,000.00 payable on August 1, 2006; (2) Promissory Note No. 08-28572-1-01 for P163,000,000.00 payable on October 1, 2006; (3) Promissory Note No. 08-28584-5-01 for P5,000,000.00 payable on October 1, 2006; (4) Promissory Note No. 05-28591-8-01 for P37,000,000.00 payable on October 1, 2006; (5) Promissory Note No. 08-28612-4-01 for P35,500,000.00 payable on October 1, 2006; and (6) Promissory Note No. 08-28622-1-01 for P3,000,000.00 payable on August 1, 2006.

[2] *Id.*, p. 547.

N.B. Filipino Vastland and BF Homes have common directors and officers. See Testimony of Fernando Javier, Vice President for Administration of BF Homes, TSN, July 31, 2013, p. 10; Rollo, p. 659.

[3] Id., pp. 470-471. Under MB Res. No. 477, the 30-day emergency loan was approved provided that the amount shall be secured by past due loan receivables secured by real estate mortgages.

[4] Id., p. 476.

[5] Id., pp. 508, 525-534.

[6] Id., p. 509. Paragraph 1 of the Deed of Assignment of Mortgage reads:

1. It is understood that by virtue of the indorsement and delivery of the negotiable promissory notes, the ASSIGNEE [BSP] acquires all the rights of the ASSIGNOR [Banco Filipino], either as payee and/or mortgagee, including the right to enforce payments as holder of the promissory notes pursuant to the Negotiable Instruments Law and the right to foreclose, judicially or extra-judicially, as if it was the original payee and/or mortgagee. For this purpose, the ASSIGNEE is hereby designated as the substitute attorney-in-fact and may enforce its right to foreclose the mortgaged property as the ASSIGNOR may have under the mortgage deed executed by and between the original borrower and the assignor herein in accordance with Act No. 3135, as amended.

[7] The Promissory Note and Trust Receipt Agreements were executed on May 2, 2009; June 2, 2009; July 2, 2009; July 31, 2009; August 30, 2009; September 28, 2009; and October 28, 2009. Id., pp. 480-506. N.B. All the Promissory Note with Trust Receipt Agreement contained the stipulation that:

“ xxx It is agreed that in the event of the insolvency or bankruptcy of, or the appointment of a receiver for, the undersigned, or in the event of its property and business being taken possession of, or its business being suspended by, or it being closed by, the lawfully authorized government agency or authority, this note and all the said other liabilities and each of them shall immediately become due and payable, without demand or notice.” [Id., pp. 477, 485, 489, 493, 497, 501, and 505.]

[8] Id., p. 504.

[9] On August 27, 2010, the BSP through its Department of Loans and Credit (DLC) sent a letter to Banco Filipino reminding it that the Emergency Loan is “under past due status”. Despite the reminder, Banco Filipino failed to pay the loan. Id., p. 562.

[10] Id., pp. 567-568.

[11] Id., pp. 571, 573.

[12] Id., p. 264.

[13] Id., pp. 575-577. Docketed as EJP No. F-13-073.

[14] Id., p. 665. See Testimony of Fernando Javier, Vice President for Administration of BF Homes, TSN, July 31, 2013, p. 16.

[15] BF Homes enumerated the following prayers in its Petition for Declaratory Relief and Prohibition:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, it is most respectfully prayed of the Honorable Court that the judgment be rendered in favor of the petitioner as follows:

1. Making a declaration on the rights and duties of the mortgagor and mortgagee, in particular the right of the mortgagee-respondent, in particular the right of the mortgagee-respondent BSP to initiate foreclosure proceedings at this point in time:

a. As to whether or not the property of BF Homes, Inc. mortgaged to secure Promissory Note Nos. 08-28543-8-01, 08-28572-1-01, 08-28584-5-01, 08-28591-8-01, 08-28612-4-01, and 08-28622-1-01, dated

August 1, 2001, October 1, 2001, October 19, 2001, October 30, 2001, December 3, 2001, and December 10, 2001, respectively in favor of BFSMB may be foreclosed for the alleged default by BFSMB in Promissory Notes dated April 1, 2009 in favor of BSP.

b. Whether or not Promissory Note dated April 1, 2009 in favor of BSP is due and demandable.

c. Whether or not the Deed of Assignment between BFSMB and BSP is valid and binding upon herein plaintiff.

2. Pending resolution of the foregoing issues, for the Honorable Court to Order the issuance of a writ of prohibition commanding respondent Clerk of Court and Ex-Officio Sheriff of the Regional Trial Court of Las Piñas to desist from further (sic) of the proceedings in the Application for Extrajudicial Foreclosure of Real Estate Mortgage, docketed as Foreclosure No. F-13-073 and to likewise desist from issuing the certificate of sale on (sic) favor of BSP;

3. Pending resolution of the foregoing issues, for the Honorable Court to Order the issuance of a 72-hour temporary restraining order, ex parte, directing herein respondents to immediately desist from further proceedings in the Application for Extrajudicial Foreclosure of Real Estate Mortgage, docketed as Foreclosure No. F-13-073.

Such other reliefs just and equitable are likewise prayed for. [Id., p. 345.]

[16] Id., p. 763. Minutes of Auction Sale.

[17] Id., p. 765.

[18] Id., p. 426.

[19] Sec. 2. Petition for prohibition. - When the proceedings of any tribunal, corporation, board, officer or person, whether exercising judicial, quasi-judicial or ministerial functions, are without or in excess of its or his jurisdiction, or with grave abuse of discretion amounting to lack or excess of jurisdiction, and there is no appeal or any other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, a person aggrieved thereby may file a verified petition in the proper court, alleging the facts with certainty and praying that judgment be rendered commanding the respondent to desist from further proceedings in the action or matter specified therein, or otherwise granting such incidental reliefs as law and justice may require.

The petition shall likewise be accompanied by a certified true copy of the judgment, order or resolution subject thereof, copies of all pleadings and documents relevant and pertinent thereto, and a sworn certification of non-forum shopping as provided in the third paragraph of section 3, Rule 46.

[20] Sec. 3. Contents and filing of petition; effect of non-compliance with requirements. - xxx

It shall be filed in seven (7) clearly legible copies together with proof of service thereof on the respondent with the original copy intended for the court indicated as such by the petitioner, and shall be accompanied by a clearly legible duplicate original or certified true copy of the judgment, order, resolution, or ruling subject thereof, such material portions of the record as are referred to therein, and other documents relevant or pertinent thereto. xxx

The petitioner shall also submit together with the petition a sworn certification that he has not theretofore commenced any other action involving the same issues in the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals or different divisions thereof, or any other tribunal or agency; if there is such other action or proceeding, he must state the status of the same; and if he should thereafter learn that a similar action or proceeding has been filed or is pending before the Supreme Court, the Court of Appeals, or different divisions thereof, or any other tribunal or agency, he undertakes to promptly inform the aforesaid courts and other tribunal or agency thereof within five (5) days therefrom.

The petitioner shall pay the corresponding docket and other lawful fees to the clerk of court and deposit the

amount of P500.00 for costs at the time of the filing of the petition.

The failure of the petitioner to comply with any of the foregoing requirements shall be sufficient ground for the dismissal of the petition.

[21] Rollo, pp. 93-95. The trial court ratiocinated thus:

Respondent BSP also raised the matter of failure to pay the correct docket fees claiming that despite being designated as a petition for declaratory relief, it is in reality a real action. This cannot be sustained. As correctly argued by the petitioner, the main subject matter of the petition is the determination of respective rights of the parties under the Deed of Assignment, and therefore, it is clear that this case is not a real action.

xxxWith regards (sic) to the ground raised that the venue is improperly laid, either way, petitioner was correct in filing the instant case in Las Piñas City. If it were a real action, the matter should be filed where the real property is situated, which in this case, is in Las Piñas City. If it were a personal action, the matter should be filed in the residence of the plaintiff or the defendants, at the election of the plaintiff. The Ex-Officio Sheriff of Las Piñas City happened to be impleaded as one of the respondents in this case. Venue, therefore, was not improperly laid.

xxxAdditionally, among the requisites of Declaratory Relief is that the party seeking the relief should have legal interest in the controversy. *Velarde vs Social Justice Society*, supra, defined legal interest as “personal and substantial interest in the case, such that the party has sustained or will sustain direct injury as a result of the challenged act xxx material interest in issue that is affected by the questioned act or instrument, as distinguished from a mere incidental interest in the question involved.” In the present case, it is undisputed that the property sought to be foreclosed belongs to herein petitioner. What is disputed is the fact that the obligation which said property secured is already due and demandable and that petitioner did not give consent to the assignment of credit in favor of respondent BSP. Its property being in danger of foreclosure, petitioner, therefore, has legal interest in the controversy.

xxx

[22] Id., pp. 97-99. December 13, 2013 Order.

[23] Id., pp. 28-29. BSP enumerates the following grounds for the Petition for Certiorari:

I. THE CASE A QUO AFFECTS THE TITLE TO AND INTEREST IN REAL PROPERTY AND IS, CONSEQUENTLY, A REAL ACTION. THUS, THE DOCKET FEES PAID BY RESPONDENT BF HOMES SHOULD HAVE CORRESPONDED TO THE VALUE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY. SINCE RESPONDENT BF HOMES FAILED TO PAY THE CORRECT AND PROPER DOCKET FEES, THE COURT A QUO FAILED TO OBTAIN JURISDICTION OVER THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE PETITION A QUO. HENCE, THE CASE A QUO SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED OUTRIGHT.

II. ASSUMING THAT THE CASE A QUO IS NOT A REAL ACTION, VENUE IS IMPROPERLY LAID SINCE NONE OF THE PRINCIPAL DEFENDANTS ARE FOUND IN LAS PIÑAS CITY AND RESPONDENT EX-OFFICIO SHERIFF OF LAS PIÑAS CITY, DESPITE BEING IMPEADED, IS MERELY A NOMINAL PARTY, AS BORNE BY ITS OWN MANIFESTATON DATED 27 AUGUST 2013.

III. EVEN ASSUMING THAT THE PETITION A QUO IS ONE FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF, THE FORECLOSURE AND PUBLIC AUCTION SALE OF THE SUBJECT PROPERTY HELD ON 24 JULY 2013 NECESSARILY MEANS THAT THE DECLARATORY RELIEF IS NO LONGER AVAILABLE TO REPSONDENT BF HOMES.

IV. FURTHER, ASSUMING THAT THE PETITION A QUO IS ONE FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF, THE CONDUCT OF THE AUCTION SALE ON 24 JULY 2013, THE ISSUANCE OF THE CERTIFICATE OF SALE DATED 31 JULY 2013, AND ITS ANNOTATION ON TCT NO. (69062) T-34857-A RENDERED THE

ISSUES RAISED IN THE SAID PETITION MOOT AND ACADEMIC.

V. IN ANY EVENT, THE REQUISITES FOR A PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF ARE NOT PRESENT IN THE CASE A QUO.

A. RESPONDENT BF HOMES, WHO IS ADMITTEDLY NOT A PARTY TO THE DEED OF ASSIGNMENT OF MORTGAGE – THE SUBJECT OF THE PETITION A QUO – IS PRECLUDED FROM FILING A PETITION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND SEEK A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION OF SUCH CONTRACT.

B. THE PETITION A QUO CLEARLY ALLEGES THAT THERE HAS ALREADY BEEN A PURPORTED BREACH OF THE DEED OF ASSIGNMENT OF MORTGAGE EXECUTED BY BANCO FILIPINO AND PETITIONER BSP.

C. RESPONDENT BF HOMES DOES NOT PRESENT ANY TERM OR PROVISION OF THE DEED OF ASSIGNMENT OF MORTGAGE WHICH REQUIRES JUDICIAL CONSTRUCTION.

VI. THE CLAIM SET FORTH IN THE PETITION A QUO HAS BEEN ABANDONED OR OTHERWISE EXTINGUISHED BECAUSE RESPONDENT BF HOMES IS UNDENIABLY GUILTY OF LACHES.

VII. ASSUMING THAT THE PETITION A QUO CAN BE TREATED AS ONE FOR PROHIBITION, THE SAME SHOULD HAVE BEEN DISMISSED OUTRIGHT FOR FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE MANDATORY REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 2, RULE 65 IN RELATION TO SECTION 3, RULE 46 OF THE RULES OF COURT.

[24] Id., p. 1030.

[25] Id., pp. 1080-1087.

[26] The Court NOTES the Reply and Manifestation filed by BSP on August 7, 2014 and September 3, 2014, respectively. Id., pp. 1052-1093.

[27] Commissioner of Customs and the District Collector of the Port of Subic v. Hypermix Feeds Corporation, G.R. No. 179579, February 1, 2012 citing Tolentino v. Board of Accountancy, 90 Phil. 83 (1951).

[28] cf. Brother Mariano “Mike” Z. Velarde v. Social Justice Society, G.R. No. 159357, April 28, 2004 citing Integrated Bar of the Philippines v. Zamora, 338 SCRA 81, August 15, 2000; citing Joya v. PCGG, 225 SCRA 568, 576, August 24, 1993.

[29] Ibid.

[30] Irene Marcos-Araneta, et al. v. Court of Appeals, G.R. No. 154096, August 22, 2008 citing Feria, Jose Y., 1 Civil Procedure Annotated 261 (2001).

[31] Id., citing Regalado, Florenz D., 1 Remedial Law Compendium 108 (8th ed., 2002).

[32] Supra at note 17 and 18.

[33] Phil-Ville Development and Housing Corporation v. Maximo Bonifacio, et al., G.R. No. 167391, June 8, 2011.

[34] Rule 63, Section 6. Conversion into ordinary action. - If before the final termination of the case, a breach or violation of an instrument or a statute, executive order or regulation, ordinance, or any other governmental regulation should take place, the action may thereupon be converted into an ordinary action, and the parties shall be allowed to file such pleadings as may be necessary or proper.

[35] See Rafael R. Martelino, et al. v. National Home Mortgage Finance Corporation and Home Development Mutual Fund, G.R. No. 160208, June 30, 2008.

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.