

EDGARDO E. MENDOZA, PETITIONER, VS. HON. ABUNDIO Z. ARRIETA, PRESIDING JUDGE OF BRANCH VIII, COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF MANILA, FELINO TIMBOL, AND RODOLFO SALAZAR, RESPONDENTS.

G.R. No. L-32599. June 29, 1979

Ponente: MELENCIO-HERRERA, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/716d8a8fb66f/>

MELENCIO-HERRERA, J.:

Petitioner, Edgardo Mendoza, seeks a review on Certiorari of the Orders of respondent Judge in Civil Case No. 80803 dismissing his Complaint for Damages based on quasi-delict against respondents Felino Timbol and Rodolfo Salazar.

The facts which spawned the present controversy may be summarized as follows:

On October 22, 1969, at about 4:00 'o'clock in the after-noon, a three-way vehicular accident occurred along Mac-Arthur Highway, Marilao, Bulacan, involving a Mercedes Benz owned and driven by petitioner; a private jeep owned and driven by respondent Rodolfo Salazar; and a gravel and sand truck owned by respondent Felino Timbol and driven by Freddie Montoya. As a consequence of said mishap, two separate Informations for Reckless Imprudence Causing Damage to Property were filed against Rodolfo Salazar and Freddie Montoya with the Court of First Instance of Bulacan. The case against truck-driver Montoya, docketed as Criminal Case No. SM-227, was for causing damage to the jeep owned by Salazar, in the amount of P1,604.00, by hitting it at the right rear portion thereby causing said jeep to hit and bump an oncoming car, which happened to be petitioner's Mercedes Benz. The case against jeep-owner-driver Salazar, docketed as Criminal Case No. SM-228, was for causing damage to the Mercedes Benz of petitioner in the amount of P8,890.00.

At the joint trial of the above cases, petitioner testified that jeep-owner-driver Salazar overtook the truck driven by Montoya, swerved to the left going towards the poblacion of Marilao, and hit his car which was bound for Manila. Petitioner further testified that before the impact, Salazar had jumped from the jeep and that he was not aware that Salazar's jeep was bumped from behind by the truck driven by Montoya. Petitioner's version of the accident was adopted by truck-driver Montoya. Jeep-owner-driver Salazar, on the other hand, tried to show that, after overtaking the truck driven by Montoya, he flashed a signal indicating his intention to turn left towards the poblacion of Marilao but was stopped at the intersection by a policeman who was directing traffic; that while he was at a stop position, his jeep was bumped at the rear by the truck driven by Montoya causing him to be thrown out of the jeep, which then swerved to the left and hit petitioner's car, which was co-ming from the opposite direction.

On July 31, 1970, the Court of First Instance of Bulacan, Branch V, Sta. Maria, rendered judgment, stating in its decretal portion:

"IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING, this Court finds the accused Freddie Montoya GUILTY beyond reasonable

doubt of the crime of damage to property thru reck-less imprudence in Crim. Case No. SM--227, and hereby sentences him to pay a fine of P972.50 and to indemnify Rodolfo Salazar in the same amount of P972.50 as actual damages, with subsidiary im-prisonment in case of insolvency, both as to fine and indemnity, with costs.

"Accused Rodolfo Salazar is here-by ACQUITTED from the offense charged in Crim. Case No. SM-228, with costs de officio, and his bond is ordered cancelled.

"SO ORDERED."[1]

Thus, the trial Court absolved jeep-owner-driver Salazar of any liability, civil and criminal, in view of its findings that the collision between Salazar's jeep and petitioner's car was the result of the former having been bumped from behind by the truck driven by Montoya. Neither was petitioner awarded damages as he was not a complainant against truck-driver Montoya but only against jeep-owner-driver Salazar.

On August 22, 1970, or after the termination of the criminal cases, petitioner filed Civil Case No. 80803 with the Court of First Instance of Manila against respondents jeep-owner--driver Salazar and Felino Timbol, the latter being the owner of the gravel and sand truck driven by Montoya, for indemnifi-cation for the damages sustained by his car as a result of the collision involving their vehicles. Jeep-owner-driver Salazar and truck-owner Timbol were joined as defendants, either in the alternative or in solidum, allegedly for the reason that petitioner was uncertain as to whether he was entitled to relief against both or only one of them.

On September 9, 1970, truck-owner Timbol filed a Motion to Dismiss Civil Case No. 80803 on the grounds that the Complaint is barred by a prior judgment in the criminal cases and that it fails to state a cause of action. An Opposition there-to was filed by petitioner.

In an Order dated September 12, 1970, respondent Judge dismissed the Complaint against truck-owner Timbol for rea-sons stated in the aforementioned Motion to Dismiss. On September 30, 1970, petitioner sought before this Court the review of that dismissal, to which petition we gave due course.

On January 30, 1971, upon motion of jeep-owner-driver Salazar, respondent Judge also dismissed the case as against the former. Respondent Judge reasoned out that "while it is true that an independent civil action for liability under Article 2177 of the Civil Code could be prosecuted independently of the criminal action for the offense from which it arose, the New Rules of Court, which took effect on January 1, 1964, requires an express reservation of the civil action to be made in the criminal action; otherwise, the same would be barred pursuant to Section 2, Rule 111 x x x." [2] Petitioner's Motion for Reconsideration thereof was denied in the Order dated February 23, 1971, with respondent Judge suggesting that the issue be raised to a higher Court "for a more decisive interpretation of the rule." [3]

On March 25, 1971, petitioner then filed a Supplemental Petition before us, also to review the last two mentioned Orders, to which we required jeep-owner-driver Salazar to file an Answer.

The Complaint against truck-owner Timbol

We shall first discuss the validity of the Order, dated September 12, 1970, dismissing petitioner's Complaint against truck-owner Timbol.

In dismissing the Complaint against the truck-owner, respondent Judge sustained Timbol's allegations that the civil suit is barred by the prior joint judgment in Criminal Cases Nos. SM-227 and SM-228, wherein no reservation to file a separate civil case was made by petitioner and where the latter actively participated in the trial and tried to prove damages against jeep driver Salazar only; and that the Complaint does not state a cause of

action against truck-owner Timbol inasmuch as petitioner prosecuted jeep-owner-driver Salazar as the one solely responsible for the damage suffered by his car.

Well-settled is the rule that for a prior judgment to constitute a bar to a subsequent case, the following requisites must concur: (1) it must be a final judgment; (2) it must have been rendered by a Court having jurisdiction over the subject matter and over the parties; (3) it must be a judgment on the merits; and (4) there must be, between the first and second actions, identity of parties, identity of subject matter and identity of cause of action.

It is conceded that the first three requisites of *res judicata* are present. However, we agree with petitioner that there is no identity of cause of action between Criminal Case No. SM-227 and Civil Case No. 80803. Obvious is the fact that in said criminal case truck driver Montoya was not prosecuted for damage to petitioner's car but for damage to the jeep. Neither was truck-owner Timbol a party in said case. In fact as the trial Court had put it "the owner of the Mercedes Benz cannot re-cover any damages from the accused Freddie Montoya, he (Mendoza) being a complainant only against Rodolfo Salazar in Criminal Case No. SM-228." [4] And more importantly, in the criminal cases, the cause of action was the enforcement of the civil liability arising from criminal negligence under Article 100 of the Revised Penal Code, whereas Civil Case No. 80803 is based on quasi-delict under Article 2180, in relation to Article 2176 of the Civil Code. As held in *Barredo vs. Garcia, et al.* [5]

"The foregoing authorities clearly demonstrate the separate individuality of *cuasi-delitos* or *culpa aquiliana* under the Civil Code. Specifically they show that there is a distinction between civil liability arising from criminal negligence (governed by the Penal Code) and responsibility for fault or negligence under articles 1902 to 1910 of the Civil Code, and that the same negligent act may produce either a civil liability arising from a crime under the Penal Code, or a separate responsibility for fault or negligence under articles 1902 to 1910 of the Civil Code. Still more concretely, the authorities above cited render it inescapable to conclude that the employer in this case the defendant-petitioner is primarily and directly liable under article 1903 of the Civil Code."

That petitioner's cause of action against Timbol in the civil case is based on quasi-delict is evident from the recitals in the complaint, to wit: that while petitioner was driving his car along MacArthur Highway at Marilao, Bulacan, a jeep owned and driven by Salazar suddenly swerved to his (petitioner's) lane and collided with his car; that the sudden swerving of Salazar's jeep was caused either by the negligence and lack of skill of Freddie Montoya, Timbol's employee, who was then driving a gravel and sand truck in the same direction as Salazar's jeep; and that as a consequence of the collision, petitioner's car suffered extensive damage amounting to P12,248.20 and that he likewise incurred actual and moral damages, litigation expenses and attorney's fees. Clearly, therefore, the two factors that a cause of action must consist of, namely: (1) plaintiff's primary right, i.e., that he is the owner of a Mercedes Benz, and (2) defendant's delict or wrongful act or omission which violated plaintiff's primary right, i.e., the negligence or lack of skill either of jeep-owner Salazar or of Timbol's employee, Montoya, in driving the truck, causing Salazar's jeep to swerve and collide with petitioner's car, were alleged in the Complaint. [6]

Consequently, petitioner's cause of action being based on quasi-delict, respondent Judge committed reversible error when he dismissed the civil suit against the truck-owner, as said case may proceed independently of the criminal proceedings and regardless of the result of the latter.

"Art. 31. When the civil action is based on an obligation not arising from the act or omission complained of as a felony, such civil action may proceed independently of the criminal proceedings and regardless of the result of the latter."

But it is truck-owner Timbol's submission (as well as that of jeep-owner-driver Salazar) that petitioner's failure to make a reservation in the criminal action of his right to file an independent civil action bars the institution of such

separate civil action, invoking section 2, rule 111, Rules of Court, which says:

"Section 2. - Independent civil action. - In the cases provided for in Articles 31, 32, 33, 34 and 2177 of the Civil Code of the Philippines, an independent civil action entirely separate and distinct from the criminal action, may be brought by the injured party during the pendency of the criminal case, provided the right is reserved as required in the preceding section. Such civil action shall proceed independently of the criminal prosecution, and shall require only a preponderance of evidence."

Interpreting the above provision, this Court, in *Garcia vs. Florido*,^[7] said:

"As we have stated at the outset, the same negligent act causing damages may produce a civil liability arising from crime or create an action for quasi-delict or culpa extra-contractual. The former is a violation of the criminal law, while the latter is a distinct and independent negligence, having always had its own foundation and individuality. Some legal writers are of the view that in accordance with Article 31, the civil action based upon quasi-delict may proceed independently of the criminal proceeding for criminal negligence and regardless of the result of the latter. Hence, 'the proviso in Section 2 of Rule 111 with reference to x x x Articles 32, 33 and 34 of the Civil Code is contrary to the letter and spirit of the said articles, for these articles were drafted x x x and are intended to constitute as exceptions to the general rule stated in what is now Section 1 of Rule 111. The proviso, which is procedural, may also be regarded as an unauthorized amendment of substantive law, Articles 32, 33 and 34 of the Civil Code, which do not provide for the reservation required in the proviso.' x x x x".

In his concurring opinion in the above case, Mr. Justice Antonio Barredo further observed that inasmuch as Articles 2176 and 2177 of the Civil Code create a civil liability distinct and different from the civil action arising from the offense of negligence under the Revised Penal Code, no reservation, therefore, need be made in the criminal case; that Section 2 of Rule 111 is inoperative, "it being substantive in character and is not within the power of the Supreme Court to promulgate; and even if it were not substantive but adjective, it cannot stand because of its inconsistency with Article 2177, an enactment of the legislature superseding the Rules of 1940."

We declare, therefore, that in so far as truck-owner Timbol is concerned, Civil Case No. 80803 is not barred by the fact that petitioner failed to reserve, in the criminal action, his right to file an independent civil action based on quasi-delict.

The suit against jeep-owner-driver Salazar

The case as against jeep-owner-driver Salazar, who was acquitted in Criminal Case No. SM-228, presents a different picture altogether.

At the outset it should be clarified that inasmuch as civil liability coexists with criminal responsibility in negligence cases, the offended party has the option between an action for enforcement of civil liability based on culpa criminal under Article 100 of the Revised Penal Code, and an action for recovery of damages based on culpa aquiliana under Article 2177 of the Civil Code. The action for enforcement of civil liability based on culpa criminal under section 1 of Rule 111 of the Rules of Court is deemed simultaneously instituted with the criminal action, unless expressly waived or reserved for separate application by the offended party.^[8]

The circumstances attendant to the criminal case yields the conclusion that petitioner had opted to base his cause of action against jeep-owner-driver Salazar on culpa criminal and not on culpa aquiliana, as evidenced by his active participation and intervention in the prosecution of the criminal suit against said Salazar. The latter's civil liability continued to be involved in the criminal action until its termination. Such being the case, there was no need for petitioner to have reserved his right to file a separate civil action as his action for civil liability was deemed impliedly instituted in Criminal Case No. SM-228.

Neither would an independent civil action lie. Noteworthy is the basis of the acquittal of jeep-owner-driver Salazar in the criminal case, expounded by the trial Court in this wise:

"In view of what has been proven and established during the trial, accused Freddie Montoya would be held liable for having bumped and hit the rear portion of the jeep driven by the accused Rodolfo Salazar.

"Considering that the collision between the jeep driven by Rodolfo Salazar and the car owned and driven by Edgardo Mendoza was the result of the hitting on the rear of the jeep by the truck driven by Freddie Montoya, this Court believes that accused Rodolfo Salazar cannot be held liable for the damages sustained by Edgardo Mendoza's car." [9]

Crystal clear is the trial Court's pronouncement that under the facts of the case, jeep-owner-driver Salazar cannot be held liable for the damages sustained by petitioner's car. In other words, "the fact from which the civil might arise did not exist." Accordingly, inasmuch as petitioner's cause of action as against jeep-owner-driver Salazar is ex-delictu, founded on Article 100 of the Revised Penal Code, the civil action must be held to have been extinguished consonance with Section 3(c), Rule 111 of the Rules of Court [10] which provides:

"Sec. 3. Other civil actions arising from offenses. - In all cases not included in the preceding section the following rules shall be observed:

x x x

(c) Extinction of the penal action does not carry with it extinction of the civil, unless the extinction proceeds from a declaration in a final judgment that the fact from which the civil might arise did not exist. x x x "

And even if petitioner's cause of action as against jeep-owner--driver Salazar were not ex-delictu, the end result would be the same, it being clear from the judgment in the criminal case that Salazar's acquittal was not based upon reasonable doubt, conse-quentially, a civil action for damages can no longer be instituted. This is explicitly provided for in Article 29 of the Civil Code quoted hereunder:

"Art. 29. When the accused in a criminal prosecution is acquitted on the ground that his guilt has not been proved beyond reasonable doubt, a civil action for damages for the same act or omission may be instituted. Such action requires only a preponderance of evidence. x x x

"If in a criminal case the judgment of acquittal is based upon reasonable doubt, the court shall so declare. In the absence of any declaration to that effect, it may be inferred from the text of the decision whether or not the acquit-tal is due to that ground."

In so far as the suit against jeep-owner-driver Salazar is concerned, therefore, we sustain respondent Judge's Order dated January 30, 1971 dismissing the complaint, albeit on different grounds.

WHEREFORE, 1) the Order dated September 12, 1970 dismissing Civil Case No. 80803 against private respondent Felino Timbol is set aside, and respondent Judge, or his suc-cessor, hereby ordered to proceed with the hearing on the me-rits; 2) but the Orders dated January 30, 1971 and February 23, 1971 dismissing the Complaint in Civil Case No. 80803 against respondent Rodolfo Salazar are hereby upheld.

No costs.

SO ORDERED.

Teehankee, (Chairman), Makasiar, Fernandez, Guerrero, and De Castro, JJ., concur.

[1] p. 26, Rollo

[2] pp. 147-149, *ibid.*

[3] pp. 138-139, *ibid.*

[4] Decision, p. 26, *ibid.*

[5] 73 Phil. 607, 620 (1942)

[6] *Racoma vs. Fortich*, 39 SCRA 521 (1971)

[7] 52 SCRA 420 (1973)

[8] *Padua vs. Robles*, 66 SCRA 485 (1975)

[9] pp. 25-26, *Rollo*

[10] *Elcano vs. Hill* 77 SCRA 98 (1977)

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.