

**IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION FOR ADMISSION AS CITIZEN OF
THE PHILIPPINES; PABLO LEE ALIAS ENG JIO,
PETITIONER-APPELLEE, VS. REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES,
OPPOSITOR-APPELLANT.**

G.R. No. L-20148. April 30, 1965

Ponente: REYES, J.B.L., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/5e3030849fe6/>

REYES, J.B.L., J.:

The Solicitor General has appealed from a decision of the Court of First Instance of Cebu (in its naturalization case No. 606) declaring petitioner Pablo Lee alias Eng Jio entitled to naturalization as a Filipino citizen.

It is the burden of the State's appeal that the trial court failed to give due weight to the petitioner's use of an alias, without proper authority to do so, and in erroneously holding as duly proved that the petitioner held a lucrative trade, profession or occupation.

We find merit in the appeal.

The exhibits (F, I, J, K, L, M, N, O and P) reveal that the applicant-appellee has been using the names of Pablo Lee and Eng Jio, the latter as an alias; and this is also shown in his application. No showing is made that the use of the alias has been authorized, as required by Commonwealth Act No. 142. The unauthorized use of aliases has been repeatedly held by this Court to be disqualifying (not irreproachable) conduct.

In *Wang I. Fu vs. Republic*, G. R. No. L-15819, promulgated on 29 September 1962, this Court ruled:

"* * *. The use of said aliases is not explained and there is no showing that it has been authorized as required by the Alias Law (Commonwealth Act No. 142). Being violative of the law, We think this act of petitioner is not beyond reproach and is, therefore, a ground for denying his application for naturalization. (See *Koa Gui vs. Republic*, G. R. No. L-17317, July 31, 1962; *Lim Bun vs. Republic*, G. R. No. L-12822, April 26, 1961; and *Ng Liam Keng vs. Republic*, G. R. No. L-14146, April 29, 1961.)"

On the issue of the applicant's having a lucrative trade, profession or occupation, applicant only testified that he is a graduate engineer, employed by the Lu Tai Lumber Co., at a stipend of P250.00 with free board and lodging. Admittedly, applicant owns no real property. It was shown, however, that the Lumber Company is owned by a partnership in which applicant's father has an interest and that the petitioner, who is single, in fact lives with his parents. Moreover, while in Exhibit X the Lu Tai Lumber Company certified, as of 17 July 1961, that the petitioner "is an employee here with this office," no specific salary is mentioned; and the income tax returns (Exhs. Y and B) submitted by the applicant cover the year 1961, which is later than the filing of his application in November of 1960.

All the foregoing circumstances render dubious the applicant's claim to a lucrative occupation. It hardly needs emphasizing that the qualifications of an applicant must be possessed by him at the time he applies for naturalization, and not subsequently.

In the case of *Que Choc Gui vs. Republic*, G. R. L-16184, this court ruled:

"Lastly, petitioner's only income is a monthly salary of P150 he claims to receive as salesman in the aforementioned store since June 1, 1908. We have repeatedly declared that such income, allegedly derived from employment in a business enterprise of petitioner's father, is insufficient to establish compliance with the statutory requirement of lucrative occupation or calling (*Sy Ang Hoc vs. Republic*, L-12400, March 29, 1961; *Richard Velasco vs. Republic*, L-12214, May 25, 1960; *Tan vs. Republic*, L-14861, March 17, 1961; *Zacarias vs. Republic*, L-14860, May 30, 1900, May 30, 1961)."

It is urged for the applicant that no opposition has been registered against his petition on the issues above-discussed. Absence of opposition, does not preclude the scanning of the whole record by the appellate court, with a view to preventing the conferment of citizenship to persons not fully qualified therefor (*Lee Ng Len vs. Republic*, G. R. No. L-20151, March 31, 1965). The applicant's complaint of unfairness could have some weight if the objections on appeal had been on points not previously passed upon. But the deficiencies here in question are not new but well-known, having been ruled upon repeatedly by this Court, and we see no excuse for failing to take them into account.

We agree with the counsel for the government that the evidence for the applicant does not fully satisfy that he possesses all the qualifications required by the law.

WHEREFORE, the decision appealed from is reversed, and the application for naturalization is ordered dismissed. Costs against applicant-appellee.

Bengzon, C.J., Bautista Angelo, Concepcion, Barrera, Paredes, Dizon, Regala, Makalintal, Bengzon, J.P. and Zaldivar, 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.