

## THE PROVINCIAL BOARD OF AGUSAN, AND FELIX M. ZAMAR, SR., AS PROVINCIAL TREASURER OF AGUSAN, PETITIONERS, VS. PASTOR D. AGO AND HON. MANUEL LOPEZ ENAGE AS JUDGE OF THE COURT OF F...

*G.R. No. L-29414. October 31, 1979*

Ponente: CONCEPCION JR., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/6d7357e9c1d7/>

---

### CONCEPCION JR., J.:

This is a petition for certiorari and mandamus with prohibition, seeking to annul and set aside the order of respondent Judge dismissing the appeal in Special Case No. 60 of the Court of First Instance of Agusan entitled: "Pastor D. Ago, petitioner, versus Felix G. Martinez, et al., respondents", for having been filed out of time.

The record of the case discloses that on September 29, 1958 herein private respondent Pastor D. Ago filed a petition for injunction with preliminary injunction with the Court of First Instance of Agusan, to restrain the Provincial Board of the Province of Agusan from conducting another public sale of the lot formerly used for the official residence of the Provincial Governor of Agusan for the reason that he had acquired a vested right over the lot by virtue of the approval and acceptance of his bid by the Provincial Board of Agusan on July 28, 1958.[1]

On October 10, 1958, the Provincial Fiscal of Agusan filed an answer to the petition disputing the claim of Ago.[2]

On August 14, 1964, the parties submitted a stipulation of facts[3] and upon their motion,[4] the respondent Judge rendered a decision on November 6, 1967, based upon the pleadings and the stipulation of facts submitted by the parties.[5]

The Provincial Fiscal received a copy of the decision on November 8, 1967[6] and, not satisfied with the verdict, it being adverse to the Provincial Board, he filed a motion for the reconsideration of the decision on November 18, 1967, stating as grounds therefor that:

"1. Said decision failed to consider the condition stipulated in the 'Advertisement for Rebidding'; and

"2. That the petitioner failed to exhaust all administrative remedies."[7]

The motion for reconsideration was denied on December 12, 1967.[8] The Provincial Fiscal received a copy of the order of denial on the following day.[9] Thereupon, he filed a notice of appeal on December 28, 1967,[10] and on December 27, 1967, he requested an extension of time of thirty (30) days from January 5, 1968 within which to deposit the appeal bond and to submit the record on appeal.[11] On January 3, 1968, the Provincial Fiscal deposited the appeal bond[12] and submitted the record on appeal.[13] On July 22, 1968, Pastor Ago filed a motion to dismiss the appeal on the ground that the appeal was not filed within the reglementary period.[14] The motion was opposed by the Provincial Fiscal.[15]

On July 26, 1968, the respondent Judge dismissed the appeal as prayed for.[16] Whereupon, the Provincial Fiscal

filed the instant petition for certiorari and mandamus with prohibition, to annul and set aside the order of the respondent Judge dismissing the appeal.

The petitioners claim that their appeal was perfected within the reglementary period because the motion for reconsideration of the decision filed on November 8, 1967 suspended the period for perfecting an appeal. [17]

The respondents, upon the other hand, maintain that the appeal was filed late because the motion for reconsideration is a pro forma motion and did not suspend the running of the period for appeal.

The petition is without merit. The motion for reconsideration filed by the herein petitioners on November 18, 1967 reads, as follows:

### **"MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

"COME NOW the defendants, Provincial Treasurer and Provincial Board of Agusan thru the undersigned Provincial Fiscal of Agusan and to this Honorable Court most respectfully move for a reconsideration of the decision of this Honorable Court dated November 6, 1967 based on the following grounds:

1. Said decision failed to consider the condition stipulated in the "Advertisement for Rebidding" (Annex "A");
2. That the petitioner failed to exhaust all administrative remedies.

### **ARGUMENTS:**

"1. SAID DECISION FAILED TO CONSIDER THE CONDITION STIPULATED IN THE "ADVERTISEMENT FOR REBIDDING". -

One of the conditions imposed in the "Advertisement for Rebidding" (Annex "A") reads as follows:

"The right is reserved to reject any/or all bids, to waive any informality therein or to accept the bid as may be most advantageous to the government."

which condition is likewise incorporated in Sub-paragraph (d) of paragraph 11 of the Stipulation of Facts dated August 14, 1967.

"When the petitioner participated as a bidder and submitted his bid, he is presumed to have agreed to such a condition imposed in the advertisement for rebidding.

"The petitioner was granted a period of three (3) days from receipt of the demand letter of the Provincial Board within which to tender payment, but he failed to do so. (par. 6 & 7, Stipulation of Facts). Respondent Provincial Board passed Resolution No. 470, Series of 1958 wherein the petitioner was again granted another ten (10) days grace within which to tender full payment of the purchase price otherwise his award will be considered revoked, but the petitioner failed again to pay the amount of his bid (par. 7 & 8, Stipulation of Facts).

"Such failure of the petitioner to tender full payment of the price of his bid is a sufficient justification for the respondent Provincial Board to revoke the award based on the foregoing condition imposed in the Advertisement for Rebidding wherein the Respondent Provincial Board has reserved the right to reject any/or all bids, to waive any informality therein or to accept the bid as may be most advantageous to the government.

"2. THE PETITIONER FAILED TO EXHAUST ALL ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES: -

Before decisions of administrative bodies can be brought to the courts for review, all administrative remedies must first be exhausted:

"We agree with counsel for the defendant (should be respondent) that before resorting to take court action,

plaintiff should have exhausted all his administrative remedies. When the Secretary of Agriculture and Natural Resources reversed the decision of the Director of the Fish and Game Administration, Bureau of Science (now Bureau of Forestry), he should have appealed to the President of the Philippines, who has control over the official actions and decisions of all subordinate officers in the Executive Department (Philippine Constitution, Art. VII, Sec. 10 (1))."... (DIMAISIP VS. THE SEC. OF AGRICULTURE & NATURAL RESOURCES, CA-G.R. No. 16306, July 31, 1957.)

"PREMISES CONSIDERED, it is most respectfully prayed that this Honorable Court recon-sider its decision, dated November 6, 1967 declaring

"1. The award given to the petitioner as revoked or rejected by Board Resolution No. 470, Series of 1968 (Annex "C");

2. The right and authority of respondents to re-advertise the property in litigation for another public bidding; and

3. For other remedies which this Honorable Court may deem just and proper in the premises.

Butuan City, November 16, 1967."[18]

As will be seen, the herein petitioners did not point out specifically the findings or conclusions of the judgment which are not supported by the evidence or which are contrary to law, making express reference to the testimonial or docu-mentary evidence or to the provisions of law alleged to be contrary to such findings or conclusions as required under Section 2, Rule 37 of the Rules of Court, but merely pointed out what the trial court had allegedly failed to consider in arriving at its judgment. This Court has ruled in many instances that motions for new trial (motion for reconside-ration) on the ground that the judgment is contrary to law, without pointing out the supposed defects as required under Section 2 of Rule 37 are pro forma and do not interrupt the running of the period for the perfection of appeals.[19] It results that the motion for reconsideration filed by the herein petitioners is a pro forma motion.

Considering that the herein petitioners received a copy of the decision of the trial court on November 8, 1967, and filed their notice of appeal on December 28, 1967, after the lapse of fifty (50) days; and their appeal bond and record on appeal on January 3, 1968, after the lapse of fifty-six (56) days, their appeal was not perfected within the period prescribed by the Rules.

WHEREFORE, the petition should be, as it is hereby DISMISSED. No costs.

### **SO ORDERED.**

Antonio, Santos, and Abad Santos, JJ., concur.

Barredo, (Chairman), concur on the sole ground that the appeal bond was not filed on time.

Aquino, J., concur in the result. From December 13, 1967, when the provincial fiscal received a copy of the order denying his motion for reconsideration, he had twenty days (the remainder of the thirty-day reglementary period) within which to perfect his appeal. That means that the deadline for the perfection of the appeal was January 2, 1968.

The appeal bond was filed on January 3, 1968. It was one day late. The motion for the extension of the time within which to file the appeal bond was out of order. The period for filing the appeal bond cannot be extended. Hence, the petitioner's appeal was not perfected within the reglementary period (Reyes vs. Court of Appeals, 74 Phil. 235).

---

[1] Rollo, p. 27.

- [2] Id., p. 31.
- [3] Id., p. 36.
- [4] Id., p. 39.
- [5] Id., p. 40.
- [6] Id., p. 70.
- [7] Id., p. 52.
- [8] Id., p. 56.
- [9] Id., p. 58.
- [10] Id., p. 57.
- [11] Id., p. 58.
- [12] Id., p. 61.
- [13] Id., p. 62.
- [14] Id., p. 63.
- [15] Id., p. 70.
- [16] Id., p. 76.
- [17] Id., p. 85.
- [18] pp. 52-53, rollo.
- [19] *Dineros vs. Roque*, G.R. No. L-38837, February 27, 1979, and other cases cited therein.

---

175 6 pt 6 pt 0 3

### **CONCUR IN THE RESULT**

#### **AQUINO, J.:**

I concur in the result. From December 13, 1967, when the provincial fiscal received a copy of the order denying his motion for reconsideration, he had twenty days (the re-mainder of the thirty-day reglementary period) within which to perfect his appeal. That means that the deadline for the perfection of the appeal was January 2, 1968.

The appeal bond was filed on January 3, 1968. It was one day late. The motion for the extension of the time within which to file the appeal bond was out of order. The period for filing the appeal bond cannot be extended. Hence, the petitioner's appeal was not perfected within the reglementary period (*Reyes vs. Court of Appeals*, 74 Phil. 235).

**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.