

E.S. BALTAO & CO., INC., PETITIONER, VS. CHINA BANKING CORPORATION AND FEDERICO O. BORRROMEO, INC., RESPONDENTS.

G.R. No. L-35093. May 19, 1978

Ponente: BARREDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/5e20a0acd102/>

BARREDO, J.:

Petition for certiorari impugning the resolutions of the Court of Appeals of February 9, 1972 and April 21, 1972 in CA-G.R. No. 45569, E. S. Baltao & Co. Inc. vs. F. O. Borrromeo et al., insofar as the same dismissed the appeal of E. S. Baltao & Co. from the decision of the Court of First Instance of Rizal in Civil Case No. 6660, between the same parties, on the ground that the record on appeal filed with the trial court by herein petitioner does not "contain the date when plaintiff received copy of the appealed decision, pursuant to Section 1 (a), Rule 50 of the Rules of Court, which requirement is mandatory and jurisdictional."

When this case was set for hearing on February 8, 1978, none of the parties could reliably inform the Court as to when in fact petitioner was served with the copy of trial court's decision being appealed from, hence the Court resolved to require them to verify the matter and submit the result to the Court. On February 10, 1978, counsel for respondent China Banking Corporation submitted his "Compliance and Manifestation" stating that:

"1. Copy of the appealed Decision (dated December 28, 1968) was received by petitioner's counsel on January 28, 1969.

"2. On February 26, 1969, petitioner filed an Ex-Parte Motion for extension of 20 days from February 27, 1969 within which to file its record on appeal. On February 27, 1969, an order was issued by the trial court granting petitioner's motion for extension.

"3. Petitioner filed the Record on Appeal dated March 10, 1969 on March 12, 1969." (Page 57, Record.)

Thus, it is unquestionable that petitioner's appeal in question was in fact perfected on time.

Now, as to the omission in the record on appeal to state when petitioner was served notice of the decision, it appears that in acting on the motion to approve said record on appeal, the trial court issued the following order:

"Acting on plaintiff's Motion for Approval of Amended Record on Appeal dated the 2nd instant, and defendant China Banking Corporation having manifested its non-objection to the same, as prayed, the Branch Clerk of Court is directed to insert pages 43(a) to 43(i) attached to the Motion as Annex 'A', after page 43 of plaintiff's Record on Appeal, and to attach the subject Index Thereto. With the compliance of the above, plaintiff's Amended Record on Appeal, Notice of Appeal, Appeal Bond are APPROVED and the Clerk of Court is directed to give due course to the appeal by complying with the pertinent provisions of the Rules of Court." (Pp. 148-149, Record on Appeal.)

In a similar case decided by this Court, the trial court approved appellant's record on appeal as follows:

"It appearing that the defendants have already included the motion to dismiss, opposition filed thereto and the resolution of the court thereon, in the amended Record on Appeal filed by the defendants, and for want of any

further objection on the part of the plaintiff, AS PRAYED FOR, the amended record on appeal filed by the defendants is hereby approved. (R.A. p. 172)." (72 SCRA 417)

Ruling on the propriety of such approval, We held:

"It may be added here that when Araneta objected to the original record on appeal, it was only on the ground of omission of certain papers therein, not for its being out of time. Under the omnibus motion rule, the objection of untimeliness was waived by Araneta, and it is reasonable to assume that he would not have raised such a clearly jurisdictional fatality, if in fact the original Doronila record on appeal had been filed out of time. Since the purpose of the strict rule of literal compliance with the 'material data rule' is to avoid debate on the timeliness of the appeal, and there is here no occasion for such debate, such timeliness being a matter no longer disputable by Araneta, it should follow that the amended record on appeal may be read in the sense that the order of the court approving the same includes the finding that the original thereof had been filed on time. We hold that thus read, said amended record on appeal sufficiently complies with the rules. (Berkenkotter, *supra*, and subsequent rulings analogous thereto.) (Araneta vs. Doronila, 72 SCRA 413, 420.)

The foregoing ruling is aptly applicable to the instant case, the circumstances in the Araneta case being practically identical in the two cases. The strict rule relied upon by respondents about the application of Section 1, Rule 50 in the cases beginning with *Government of the Philippines vs. Antonio*, 15 SCRA 119, are not necessarily controlling anymore. Where appellee does not deny the factual timeliness of the appeal approved by the trial court, and the only ground invoked for dismissal is the omission in the record on appeal of the facts showing such timeliness, We regard the technical objection as inconsistent with substantial justice. (*Pimentel vs. Court of Appeals*, 64 SCRA 475; *Luna vs. Court of Appeals*, 67 SCRA 503; *Krueger vs. Court of Appeals*, 69 SCRA 50 and others of similar vein.) It may not be amiss to add here, however, that it is best that the members of the bar should make it a point to know and to comply with the rules, which are as simple as they can be, without having to depend on this Court to save the situation for their clients in the paramount interest of substantial justice.

Anent the ground being also invoked by private respondents that petitioner has not yet filed its appellant's brief notwithstanding the expiration of the original period and extensions granted by the Court of Appeals, We agree with petitioner that the issue in this case, which was resolved by the appellate court before the expiration of petitioner's period, constitutes a prejudicial question, the result of which must in logic and practical reasons be awaited, since there might be no appeal for which a brief would be needed. However, We must state that even if only out of courtesy and good practice, petitioner should have taken the proper and timely moves in the Court of Appeals for the corresponding suspension of said period.

WHEREFORE, the petition is granted; the resolutions of the Court of Appeals complained of are set aside, and the respondent Court of Appeals is directed to give due course to petitioner's appeal in question by granting it a reasonable period within which to file its brief. Costs against private respondents.

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

Antonio, 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.