

**RAYMUNDO ERFE, PETITIONER, VS. HON. WILLELMO C. FORTUN, AS
PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF BRANCH
VIII, THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT, DAGUPAN CITY, ANGELES L.
LEONO...**

G.R. No. L-39388. May 27, 1985

Ponente: ESCOLIN, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/78899eeffd55/>

ESCOLIN, J.:

This is a petition for certiorari to set aside the order of the respondent Court of First Instance of Pangasinan, which denied the motion of petitioner Raymundo Erfe, the defendant in Civil Case No. D-2910, to refer the case to the Ministry of Agrarian Reform for preliminary determination of the relationship between the contending parties in said case.

Private respondent Angeles L. Leonor and Florentina L. Biacad, through their mother and attorney-in-fact, Encarnacion A. Laygo, filed a complaint against Raymundo Erfe to recover the ownership and possession of three [3] parcels of ricelands with a total area of about one [1] hectare, situated in Bo. Anonang, San Fabian, Pangasinan. The case was docketed as Civil Case No. D-2910 of the then Court of First Instance of Pangasinan, and assigned to Branch VIII of said court, then presided by Judge Sixto Domondon. The complaint substantially alleged that plaintiffs purchased said lands from their mother Encarnacion A. Laygo, who prior to the sale had possessed the same continuously and openly for a period of over ten [10] years; that Raymundo Erfe, asserting ownership over said lands, entered the same and refused to surrender possession thereof despite the plaintiffs' repeated demands.

In his answer, Erfe averred that he was not claiming any right of dominion over the disputed properties. He alleged, however, that he has occupied and cultivated said lands continuously for a period of over ten [10] years as share tenant of Encarnacion A. Laygo, the former owner thereof. Thus, Erfe would have his security of tenure as agricultural tenant recognized and upheld by the court.

The Court *a quo*, after due hearing, rendered a decision "declaring the plaintiffs the real owners and lawful possessors of the properties described in the complaint and [ordering] the defendant to vacate the premises and surrender the possession of the properties of the herein plaintiffs. x x x."

On November 22, 1973, petitioners filed a motion for reconsideration, praying, among other things, that the case be referred to the Department [now Ministry] of Agrarian Reform, pursuant to Section 2 of Presidential Decree No. 316. On January 31, 1974, Erfe filed a second motion reiterating his plea for referral of the case.

Judge Domondon denied the motion for reconsideration by declaring "that Erfe was in estoppel and that the case was outside the purview of PD 316." Judge Domondon was later promoted to the Court of Appeals, and judge Willelmo C. Fortun was assigned to preside over the sala vacated by him. A motion for the issuance of a writ of execution was filed by private respondents, and on June 14, 1974 Judge Fortun granted said motion over the

objection of petitioner. The subsequent motion to set aside the decision and to stay execution was denied.

Hence, the instant recourse to annul the aforementioned orders of the court. This Court issued a temporary restraining order enjoining respondents from enforcing the writ of execution.

We grant the petition for certiorari. In denying the petitioner's motion to refer the case to the Ministry of Agrarian Reform, the respondent court violated the express mandate of Section 2 of PD 316, to wit:

"Sec. 2 —

Unless certified by the Secretary of Agrarian Re-forms as a proper case for trial or hearing by a court or judge or other officer of competent jurisdiction, no judge of the Court of Agrarian Relations, Court of First Instance, municipal or city court, or any other tribunal or fiscal shall take cognizance of any ejectment case or any other case designed to harass or remove a tenant of an agricultural land primarily devoted to rice and corn, and if any such cases are filed these cases shall first be referred to the Secretary of Agrarian Reform or his authorized representative in the loca-lity for a preliminary de-termination of the relationship between the contending parties. If the Secretary of Agrarian Reform finds that the case is a proper case for the Court or judge or other hearing officer to hear, he shall so certify and such court, judge or other hearing officer may assume jurisdiction over the dispute or controversy."

The fact that a decision had already been rendered by the respondent court does not justify denial of the referral sought. Under Memorandum Circular No. 29 issued by the Minister of Agrarian Reform on December 6, 1973 to implement P.D. 316, referral to the Ministry of Agrarian Reform after judgment is still mandatory where the execution of the decision would result in the ejectment of the actual tiller or the tenant farmer. Thus:

"II. When Referral Shall Be Made

2.

With respect to agrarian or civil cases submitted for decision or pending execution — before decision is rendered or before execution of decision where such decision or execution would result in the ejectment of the actual tiller or the tenant farmer in order to determine whether the defendant has become a beneficiary or a recipient of a Land Transfer Certificate pursuant to Presidential Decree No. 27;"

WHEREFORE, the respondent court's order denying petitioner's motion for referral as well as the order dated June 14, 1974 granting the writ of execution are hereby set aside. The lower court is directed to refer Civil Case No. 2910 to the Ministry of Agrarian Reform.

SO ORDERED.

Makasiar, (Chairman), Aquino, Abad Santos, and Cuevas, JJ., concur.

Concepcion, Jr., J., on leave.

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.