

ANITA U. LORENZANA, PETITIONER, VS. POLLY CAYETANO AND COURT OF APPEALS, RESPONDENTS.

G.R. No. L-37051. July 31, 1978

Ponente: GUERRERO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/75bcdc3bccfc/>

GUERRERO, J.:

There is presented to Us by petitioner a second motion for modification filed with leave of court praying that the possessory aspect of the decision rendered by the Court of Appeals which We had affirmed be modified and that the same should now be converted into a judgment for damages.

Petitioner admits the damage aspect of the appealed decision which ordered her to pay actual and moral damages in the amount of P5,500.00 to private respondent, Polly Cayetano. She submits, however, that the possessory aspect of the decision, to wit: "to restore to appellant the possession of the property invaded and occupied by her as shown in Exhibits L-1 to L-4; to put back appellant's fence and other valuable improvements in their place before the writ of demolition was served;" can no longer be enforced at this stage, first, because the question of possession thereof has become moot and academic, and second, because enforcement thereof or execution is legally impossible. In support of said motion for modification, there is attached a copy of the contract of lease (Annex A) dated May 16, 1974 whereby the Bureau of Building and Real Property Management of the Department of General Services (administrator and custodian of the subject property) leased to petitioner Lot II-B, Block 2201 of the Cadastral Survey of Manila, with an area of 700 square meters, which includes the subject property. The contract of lease is duly approved by the Secretary of General Services and petitioner as lessee, has taken possession of the leased premises and since May 16, 1974 has been paying the monthly rentals therefor.

Respondents, in a pro forma comment, merely prays for the dismissal of the motion for modification.

Previously, upon an amended motion of petitioner for prohibition with prayer for the issuance of a writ of preliminary injunction and a restraining order filed May 30, 1978, We issued in this case a restraining order on June 8, 1978 "restraining the Court of First Instance of Manila, Branch XVII and the sheriff thereof and private respondent from executing and/or enforcing the judgment issued by the said Court a quo."

We agree with the petitioner that the possessory aspect of the judgment of the Court of Appeals which We had affirmed has become moot and academic for the reasons adduced by her. Considering that the owner of the land, subject of the controversy, which is the government, acting thru the Director of the Bureau of Building and Real Property Management with the approval of the Secretary of General Services, had turned over the possession of the premises under a lease contract in favor of petitioner, which lease is admittedly legal and lawful, petitioner can no longer be compelled to restore possession of the same to the prevailing party, the private respondent herein. To do so would certainly be a violation of petitioner's property rights. By reason of a lawful act which supervened after the institution of this case, petitioner's possession of the premises has been legalized.

However, to remand this case to the lower court for execution and to assess and determine after due notice and hearing, the amount of indemnity which will be paid by petitioner to private respondent for the loss or destruction

of the improvements made by the latter on the subject property prior to the service and execution of the writ of demolition, as prayed for by movant petitioner, would unduly delay the final disposition of this case. A protracted hearing on the amount of damages is not far-fetched to see. Hence, an amount fixed by Us in the sum of P1,500.00 as the value of the fence destroyed, flower pots, trellishes, electric installations and other decorations, cement garden or patio destroyed, would appear to Us to be reasonable and satisfactory to both parties in the interest of peace as well as in fairness to both, and thus terminate this litigation once and for all.

WHEREFORE, the judgment promulgated by Us in this case is hereby modified. We hereby declare that part of the appealed decision ordering petitioner to restore possession of the property invaded and occupied by her to the private respondent and to put the fence and other valuable improvements in their place as moot and academic. For the value of the fence and other valuable improvements destroyed, petitioner is hereby ordered to pay respondent the sum of P1,500.00. In all other respects, Our decision stands.

SO ORDERED.

Teehankee, (Chairman), Makasiar, Muñoz Palma, and Fernandez, 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.