

**NORA VILLAMAYOR (ALSO KNOWN AS NORA AUNOR), PETITIONER,  
VS. THE HON. LEONOR INES LUCIANO, PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE  
JUVENILE AND DOMESTIC RELATIONS COURT OF QUEZON CITY  
AND LUCIANO...**

*G.R. No. L-44886. January 31, 1979*

Ponente: CONCEPCION, JR., J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/703cfe62272f/>

---

**CONCEPCION, JR., J.:**

Petition for certiorari to annul and set aside the orders of the respondent Judge dated April 3, 1975 and September 2, 1976.

In Special Proceedings No. QC-00657 of the Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court of Quezon City, entitled: "In the Matter of the Guardianship of the Minor Nora Villamayor, popularly known as Nora Aunor; Norberto Amoranto, Guardian," the herein private respondent, Luciano M. Dominguez, filed a motion praying for the payment of his monthly legal retainer's fees of P3,000.00 from May, 1971 to May, 1974.

On December 4, 1974, an order was issued by the respondent court directing the guardian of the estate of the minor to pay attorney's fees to Atty. Luciano M. Dominguez, herein private respondent, the amount of P108,000.00, within 30 days from receipt of the order.

On February 7, 1975, Atty. Dominguez asked for the issuance of a writ of execution, alleging non-compliance with said order, but the court granted the ward a grace period of 15 days within which to comply with the order of December 4, 1974.

The grace period given the ward elapsed without her complying with the order of December 4, 1974, so that on April 3, 1975, the respondent court ordered the issuance of a writ of execution against the ward for P108,000.00, plus legal interests thereon from December 4, 1974.[1] The corresponding writ of execution was issued on the same day.

Thereafter, the private respondent manifested that he had been paid the sum of P113,011.35, in satisfaction of the judgment credit and the amount of P5,324.55 remains unpaid; and that while he had received from the estate of the minor the amount of P43,592.05 on July 21, 1975, the said amount was for the settlement of his other claims against the ward, but not as partial payment of the judgment credit.

The petitioner also manifested that the private respondent had collected and/or received from her the total amount of P155,603.40 or P47,603.40 in excess of the amount the private respondent was granted in the order of December 4, 1974.

On March 10, 1976, the petitioner filed a motion with the respondent court to declare the order of April 3, 1975 null and void insofar as it requires the payment of interests on the amount awarded to respondent Dominguez and for the refund of the excess amount paid by the petitioner to the private respondent.[2]

On September 2, 1976, the respondent court issued an order, the dispositive portion[3] of which reads as follows:

"WHEREFORE,

"1) Atty. Luciano Dominguez's request for payment embodied in his Manifestation of January 28, and June 10, 1976 is granted only up to the amount of P4,466.71. Within fifteen (15) days from receipt, ward Nora Villamayor and her guardianship estate is hereby ordered to pay the same, under pain of contempt;

"2) Ward's Motion of March 10, 1976 is hereby DENIED, for the time being; and

"3) Let this case be set for reception of evidence re application of payment in the sum of P43,592.05 on July 21, 1975, on October 11, 1976 at 8:00 o'clock in the morning."

Now claiming that the order of April 3, 1975, directing the payment of interests on the amount of P108,000.00 and the order of September 2, 1976, specifying the amount to be paid as interests, to have been issued in excess of jurisdiction; and that there is no appeal or other plain, speedy and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, the ward Nora Villamayor filed the instant petition to annul and set aside the said orders.

The petitioner argues that the order of December 4, 1974, ordering the estate of the ward to pay Atty. Dominguez the amount of P108,000.00, had already become final and executory so that the orders of April 3, 1975 and September 2, 1976, amending or modifying the order of December 4, 1974 by requiring the payment of interests on the amount adjudicated, were illegally issued.

The defense is estoppel, in that the petitioner had acquiesced to, or recognized and ratified the partial execution of the judgment ordering the payment of interests on the judgment credit. The private respondent more particularly refers to the writs of garnishment served by the sheriff upon petitioner's debtors and private respondent was able to collect the amount of P112,011.38 as of October 23, 1975, an amount which included part of the interest on the judgment credit, and the statement of counsel for the petitioner wherein she allegedly waived petitioner's right to question the payment of interest on the judgment credit of P108,000.00.

In *Robles vs. Timario*,[4] the Court ruled that it is beyond the power of the courts to issue a writ of execution for the payment of the principal obligation with the interest thereon, when the judgment contains no provision on the interest to be paid on the judgment credit. Considering that in the instant case, the order of December 4, 1974, ordering the payment of P108,000.00 to the private respondent, did not provide for the collection of interest on the said amount, the Order of April 3, 1975, directing the issuance of a writ of execution against the petitioner for the amount of P108,000.00, plus legal interest thereon on December 4, 1974, was clearly made without or in excess of jurisdiction.

The plea of estoppel is without merit, for estoppel cannot validate a void order, issued without jurisdiction since jurisdiction exists as a matter of law, and may not be conferred by the consent of the parties, or by estoppel. Besides, it cannot be said for certain that the petitioner had acquiesced to the payment of interest on the amount of P108,000.00 in view of the petitioner's claim for the refund of the amount collected by the private respondent in excess of the said amount of P108,000.00.[5]

WHEREFORE, the petition is granted and the orders of the respondent court dated April 3, 1975 and September 2, 1976 are hereby annulled and set aside insofar as the said orders require the payment of interest on the amount of P108,000.00. Costs against the private respondent.

**SO ORDERED.**

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

---

[1] Rollo, p. 79.

[2] Id., p. 4.

[3] Id., pp. 9, 13.

[4] 107 Phil. 809.

[5] See Motion, p. 82, rollo.

**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.