

SIMEON C. FAJARDO, SUBSTITUTED BY ROSALINA VDA. DE FAJARDO, AND BERNARDO D. TOLENTINO, SUBSTITUTED BY NATIVIDAD BAUTISTA VDA. DE TOLENTINO, PETITIONERS, VS. MOONYEN B. RETIZOS, ...

Ponente: SADANG, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/860a64563c48/>

SADANG, J.:

Before this Court is a petition for review under Rule 43 of the Rules of Court seeking to annul and set aside the June 5, 2009 Decision[1] of the Office of the President in O.P. Case No. 07-H-325 which reversed and set aside the May 18, 2006 Order and August 8, 2007 Resolution of the Department of Agrarian Reform.

Case Antecedents

When Presidential Decree (P.D.) No. 27,[2] otherwise known as the "Tenants Emancipation Decree," took effect in 1972, Simeon Fajardo and Bernardo Tolentino[3] (herein petitioners) and Romeo Tadeo[4] were the tenants of a 10.5899-hectare land situated in Barangay San Isidro, Cabanatuan City registered in the name of Virginia A. Briones-Retizos (Virginia) under Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. 16393.

After the death of Virginia on September 8, 1982, or on March 4, 1987, the land became the subject of a Final Survey under Module 282. Emancipation patents were issued but they were not registered for the following reasons: "1. There was no claimfolder prepared for the tenants; 2. That prior to the conduct of Final Survey, the subject landholding was subdivided by the landowner into 12 lots and correspondingly approved on February 12, 1976; 3. That TCT No. T-16393 was cancelled; 4. That the Register of Deeds refused to register the emancipation patents."[5]

On February 28, 1998, petitioners filed a letter-petition[6] in the Department of Agrarian Reform Regional Office III, (DAR RO III), docketed as Docket No. A-0303-0122-99, A.R. Case No. LSD 0159 '2000, entitled "Re Petition for Issuance of Emancipation Patent to a Landholding Covered by TCT No. T-16393 with an Area of 10.5899 Hectares, More or Less, Situated at Barangay San Isidro, Cabanatuan City."

Herein respondents Moonyeen B. Retizos, Nelin B. Retizos, and Mavourneen B. Retizos (hereafter, respondents), as the children and legal heirs of Virginia, filed an Opposition[7] to the petition alleging that the land being cultivated by petitioners are partially covered by TCT No. T-90179,[8] TCT No. T-90183,[9] and TCT No. T-90185[10] in the name of respondent Moonyeen B. Retizos and TCT No. T-90182[11] in the name of respondent Nelin B. Retizos and said landowners are exercising their right of retention over the parcels of land which should not be covered by Operation Land Transfer (OLT). Respondents' father, Isidro Retizos, did not join them in the opposition. Respondents also filed ejectment suits against petitioners before the DAR Adjudication Board (DARAB).

In an Order,[12] dated August 30, 2000, Regional Director (RD) Nestor R. Acosta provisionally denied the petition and directed the Provincial Agrarian Reform Officer (PARO) and Municipal Agrarian Reform Officer (MARO) to proceed with the coverage of the land regardless of who may now be the owner thereof and to process

the claim folders. The fallo of the order reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, an ORDER is hereby issued as follows:

1. PROVISIONALLY DENYING the Petition for Issuance of Emancipation Patents over a landholding located at Brgy. San Isidro, Cabanatuan City and formerly registered in the name of Virginia Briones (Retizos) with title number 16393 until there is payment of just compensation and without prejudice to the DARAB cases filed against the petitioners;
2. DIRECTING the PARO and the MARO to proceed with the coverage of the landholdings regardless of who may now be the owner/s thereof and process the corresponding Claim Folders.

SO ORDERED.[13]

Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal[14] which was not signed by their counsel, thus, on October 12, 2000, RD Acosta issued an Order[15] directing the implementation of the August 30, 2000 Order without further delay as no motion for reconsideration was filed and the notice of appeal is considered not properly filed because it was not signed.

On May 18, 2006, the DAR issued an Order[16] dismissing respondents' Notice of Appeal and affirming the August 30, 2000 Order of RD Acosta.

On August 8, 2007, DAR Secretary Nasser C. Pangandaman issued a Resolution[17] denying respondents' Motion for Partial Reconsideration which sought to declare the August 30, 2000 Order as null and void for failure to observe administrative due process.

On August 22, 2007, respondents filed an Appeal[18] with the Office of the President (OP), to which petitioners filed a Comment.[19]

In a Decision,[20] dated June 5, 2009, the OP rendered judgment in favor of the respondents, the fallo of which reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the instant appeal is hereby GRANTED. The DAR Order and Resolution dated May 18, 2006 and August 8, 2007, respectively, and the August 30, 2000 Order of the DAR RO III, are hereby REVERSED and SET ASIDE. The subject property having an area of 10.5899 hectares located in Barangay San Isidro, Cabanatuan City, covered by TCT No. T-16393, is hereby EXEMPTED from the coverage of the agrarian reform law.

SO ORDERED.[21]

In the Resolution[22] dated March 1, 2010, the OP denied the petitioners' Motion for Reconsideration;[23] hence, this present petition on the ground that:

THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT FAILS TO REALISE (sic) THAT THE SUBJECT LAND WAS ALREADY COVERED BY OPERATION LAND TRANSFER.[24]

Ruling

Petitioners contend that: a final survey had been conducted and the land is already covered by "Plan Psd-03-018483 Operation Land Transfer and was approved on November 18, 1987;" the petition for issuance of emancipation patent is but the logical consequence of the land's coverage under the OLT; respondents have no right of retention because they are not the owners of the land, the transfer of the title in their names being in violation of Department Memorandum Circular No. 8, series of 1974, and P.D. 27;[25] it was imperative on respondents to prove that the original landowner, Virginia, had the intention to retain the lot during her lifetime

pursuant to Department Order No. 4, series of 1992, but Virginia showed no such intention as she merely subdivided the land into 12 lots.

In their Comment/Opposition[26] to the instant petition, respondents counter that ownership of the land was transferred to them by operation of law upon the demise of their mother, Virginia, on September 8, 1982 and they have since acquired Virginia's right of retention over the land. They contend that the applicable rule at that time was DAR Memorandum on the Interim Guidelines on Retention of Small Landowners, dated July 10, 1977, which provides that a landowner whose property is subject to P.D. 27 is allowed to retain not more than 7 hectares of his land if his aggregate landholding does not exceed 24 hectares. Respondents maintain that the OP did not err in ruling that the land is exempted from coverage of the agrarian law. They also manifested that after the OP granted their appeal, they filed a Sworn Application for retention under Republic Act No. 6657 on August 31, 2010 in the DAR RO III and their application was approved on the strength of the ruling in *Eudisia Daez v. Court of Appeals* that landowners who failed to exercise their right of retention under P.D. 27 may be allowed to do so under R.A. 6657.

In essence, the issue in this petition is whether respondents have the right to retain the land.

The right of retention, as protected and enshrined in the Constitution, balances the effects of compulsory land acquisition by granting the landowner the right to choose the area to be retained subject to legislative standards.[27] Necessarily, since the said right is granted to limit the effects of compulsory land acquisition against the landowner it is a prerequisite that the land falls under the coverage of the OLT Program of the government. If the land is beyond the ambit of the OLT Program, the landowner need not - as he should not - apply for retention since the appropriate remedy would be for him to apply for exemption.[28]

Exemption and retention in agrarian reform are two (2) distinct concepts. P.D. No. 27, under which the OLT Program is being implemented, covers tenanted rice or corn lands. The requisites for coverage under the OLT program are the following: (1) the land must be devoted to rice or corn crops; and (2) there must be a system of share-crop or lease-tenancy obtaining therein. If either requisite is absent, a landowner may apply for exemption. If either of these requisites is absent, the land is not covered under OLT. Hence, a landowner need not apply for retention where his ownership over the entire landholding is intact and undisturbed.[29]

If the land is covered by the OLT Program, which renders the right of retention operable, PD 27 confers in favor of covered landowners who cultivate or intend to cultivate an area of their tenanted rice or corn land the right to retain an area of not more than seven (7) hectares thereof.[30]

R.A. 6657, enacted on June 10, 1988, modified the retention limits under P.D. 27. This law provides that landowners are allowed to retain a portion of their tenanted land not exceeding five (5) hectares plus three (3) hectares for each child subject to the conditions that the child is: 1) at least 15 years old; and 2) actually tilling the land or directly managing the farm.

Moreover, in *Heirs of Romulo Sandueta v. Robles, et al.*,[31] it was ruled that LOI 474 amended P.D. 27 by removing the right of retention from persons who own: 1) other agricultural lands of more than seven (7) hectares in aggregate areas; or 2) lands used for residential, commercial, industrial or other urban purposes from which they derive adequate income to support themselves and their families.

There is no merit in the contention of petitioners that respondents have no right of retention because they are not the owners of the land inasmuch as the transfer of title in their names is in violation of Department Memorandum Circular No. 8, series of 1974.

The record shows that respondents are the children and legal heirs of the original landowner, Virginia. Upon the

death of Virgina in 1982, ownership of the land passed to her heirs, namely, her husband, Isidro, and herein respondents. Such transfer of ownership was by way of hereditary succession. It did not violate P.D. 27 or Department Memorandum Circular No. 8. Clearly, at the time of the final survey in 1987 and the issuance of emancipation patents, respondents and their father were already the owners of the land. And even if the titles over the subdivided lots were issued only in 1997, such does not detract from the fact that respondents and their father acquired the lots by hereditary succession in 1982. It is settled that a Torrens title is merely an evidence of title and not a mode of acquiring ownership.[32]

We find that the land is covered by the OLT Program because it is a rice land and tenanted; hence, the right of retention is operable. Moreover, the evidence does not show that respondents own either other agricultural lands of more than 7 hectares in aggregate areas or land used for residential, commercial, industrial or other urban purposes from which they derive income. The question therefore is how much of the land may be retained by respondents and their father. The aggregate area of the land is 10.5899 hectares. However, as stated earlier, before the land was subjected to final survey and emancipation patents thereon were issued, it was inherited by respondents and their father. Consequently, we agree with the finding of the OP that respondents and their father are entitled to retain seven (7) hectares each, or a total of twenty-eight (28) hectares. Inasmuch as the land in question is only 10.5899 hectares, respondents and their father have a right to retain the entire land.

We do not find merit in the contention of petitioners that respondents are not entitled to retention because their predecessor in interest, Virginia, did not exercise her right of retention during her lifetime. Neither P.D. 27 nor R.A. 6657 provides that the landowner loses his right of retention if he fails to exercise it during his lifetime. We are of the considered opinion and so hold that Virginia's right of retention which she failed to exercise was nonetheless acquired through inheritance by her heirs or successors-in-interest, herein respondents, who could exercise said right, which they did on August 31, 2010. That the right was exercised belatedly does not affect its efficacy. As held in *Daez v. Court of Appeals*,^[33] those who failed to file the required application for retention under P.D. 27 may do so under R.A. 6657. Such should be the case because the right of retention is a right granted by the 1987 Consitution no less and is clearly intended to protect small landowners. Thus, in *Tenants of the Estate of Dr. Jose Sison v. Court of Appeals*,^[34] the Supreme Court ruled that "no one, not even the petitioners tenants, nor any court of justice, can deprive or deny the landowners of the retention of seven (7) hectares which the law has reserved for them."

WHEREFORE, the petition is DENIED. The June 5, 2009 Decision of the Office of the President, in O.P. Case No. 07-H-325 and the March 1, 2010 Resolution denying petitioners' Motion for Reconsideration are AFFIRMED.

SO ORDERED.

Librea-Leagogo, (Chairperson), and Diamante, JJ., concur.

[1] Penned by Eduardo R. Ermita, Executive Secretary, Office of the President, rollo, 76-79.

[2] Presidential Decree No. 27, entitled "Decreeing The Emancipation Of Tenants From The Bondage Of The Soil, Transferring To Them The Ownership Of The Land They Till And Providing The Instruments And Mechanism Therefor." (Issued on October 21, 1972.)

[3] Per Compliance dated July 1, 2010, id. at 100-102, counsel for petitioners manifested that both petitioners had died and, accordingly, were survived by their legal heirs, as follows: Simeon C. Fajardo, who died on May 14, 2004 (Certificate of Death, id. at 104), was survived by his common-law wife Rosalina Parunog (Certification

from the Office of the Civil Registrar General, National Statistics Office dated July 6, 2010 that there was no record of marriage between the deceased and Rosalina that took place on March 8, 1962, id. at 106) and his children Generoso, Victor Noel, Joey, Emilena, Angelina, all surnamed Fajardo; and Bernardo D. Tolentino, Sr., who died on July 23, 2007 (Certificate of Death, id. at 103), was survived by his wife Natividad Bautista Vda. De Tolentino (Certification from the Office of the City Civil Registrar, City of Cabanatuan dated July 1, 2010 stating that the deceased and Natividad were married on April 29, 1945, id. at 105) and his children Priscilla, Dionisio, Remedios, Luzviminda, Bernardo, Jr., Cecilia, Yolanda, Reynaldo, all surnamed Tolentino. In a Resolution dated April 18, 2012 (id. at 146-148), the Court granted the substitution of Natividad Bautista Vda. De Tolentino and Rosalina Vda. De Fajardo as parties-petitioners.

[4] In a Resolution dated April 7, 2011 (id. at 123-124), the Court ordered that Romeo Tadeo be dropped as party-petitioner in this case, pursuant to his Sinumpaang Salaysay dated February 9, 2011 (id. at 120) declaring that he is no longer interested in pursuing the case on appeal as he and the respondents have amicably settled.

[5] O.P. Decision, Rollo, at p. 77

[6] Rollo, p. 29

[7] Id. at 32, 35.

[8] Id. at 34.

[9] Id. at 36.

[10] Id. at 37.

[11] Id. at 33.

[12] Id. at 38-42.

[13] Id. at 41-42.

[14] Id. at 43-44.

[15] Id. at 45-46.

[16] Id. at 48-55.

[17] Id. at 57-60.

[18] Id. at 61-72.

[19] Id. at 73-75.

[20] Supra note 1.

[21] Rollo, p. 79.

[22] Id. at 83-85.

[23] Id. at 80-82.

[24] Id. at 21.

[25] 4. No act shall be done to undermine or subvert the intent and provisions of Presidential Decrees, Letter of Instructions, Memoranda and Directives, such as the following and/or similar acts:

- a) Dividing or subdividing tenanted rice and/or corn lands after 21 October 1972xxx
- b) Transferring ownership of tenanted rice and/or corn lands after 21 October 1972, except to the actual tenant-farmers or tillers but in strict conformity to the provisions of Presidential Decree No. 87 and the requirements of the DAR.

[26] Rollo, pp. 133-138.

[27] Heirs of Romulo D. Sandueta v. Robles, G.R. No. 203204, November 20, 2013 citing Santiago v. Ortiz-Luis, G.R. Nos. 186184 & 186988, September 20, 2010, 630 SCRA 670, 678, which cited Section 4, Article XIII of the 1987 Philippine Constitution which reads as follows: "The State shall, by law, undertake an agrarian reform program founded on the right of farmers and regular farmworkers, who are landless, to own directly or collectively the lands they till or, in the case of other farmworkers, to receive a just share of the fruits thereof. To this end, the State shall encourage and undertake the just distribution of all agricultural lands, subject to such priorities and reasonable retention limits as the Congress may prescribe, taking into account ecological, developmental or equity considerations and subject to the payment of just compensation. In determining retention limits, the State shall respect the right of small landowners. The State shall further provide incentives for voluntary land-sharing." (Emphasis supplied in the original.)

[28] Heirs of Romulo D. Sandueta v. Robles, id.

[29] Daez v. Court of Appeals, 382 Phil. 742 (2000), cited in Heirs of Romulo D. Sandueta v. Robles, id.

[30] Heirs of Romulo D. Sandueta v. Robles, id.

PD 27 provides:

xxx xxx xxx

The tenant farmer, whether in land classified as landed estate or not, shall be deemed owner of a portion constituting a family-size farm of five (5) hectares if not irrigated and three (3) hectares if irrigated;

In all cases, the landowner may retain an area of not more than seven (7) hectares if such landowner is cultivating such area or will now cultivate it;

xxx xxx xxx.

[31] Id.

[32] Larena v. Mapili, G.R. No. 146341, August 7, 2003.

[33] Supra.

[34] G.R. No. 93045, June 29, 1992, 210 SCRA 545.

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.