

**CLARITA PIMENTEL DRAGON AND BENJAMIN S. PADAMA
REPRESENTING PATRICIA M. PIMENTEL AND NICOLAS PIMENTEL,
PLAINTIFF-APPELLLEES, VS. ROMMEL T. CARIÑO ARMANDO
LAUBAN, CITY REGISTRAR ...**

Ponente: PEREZ, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/8a403d8688da/>

PEREZ, J.:

This resolves appellees' Motion for Reconsideration[1] of the Court's Decision[2] promulgated 18 July 2014, granting appellant's appeal.

In their 03 September 2014 Motion, appellees implore this Court to reconsider and set aside the above Decision and declare the real estate mortgage over the subject property null and void.

Appellees mainly argue that Clarita P. Dragon and Ramon Pimentel, Jr. did not execute an SPA in favor of Florecita S. Pimentel to act on their behalf in mortgaging the subject property. Appellees maintain that the signature purportedly belonging to Clarita was forged and that Ramon, Jr. was already deceased when the SPA was allegedly signed. Thus, Clarita and Ramon, Jr. could not have validly mortgaged their undivided interest in the subject property.

These same issues were squarely discussed and resolved in the Decision dated 18 July 2014.

A motion for reconsideration should point out specifically the findings or conclusions of the judgment or final order which are not supported by the evidence or which are contrary to law making express reference to the testimonial or documentary evidence or to the provisions of law alleged to be contrary to such findings or conclusions.[3] This motion fails to do that. At most, the arguments in this motion are but a rehash of the issues amply addressed in the Decision sought to be reconsidered; therefore, We find no cogent reason to reverse our 18 July 2014 Decision.

WHEREFORE, the motion for reconsideration is hereby DENIED for want of merit.

SO ORDERED.

[*]Borja, J., Chairperson, and Inting, JJ., concur.

[1*] per raffle committee report dated 06-18-14, vice J. Camello who is on leave Rollo, pp. 164-172.

[2] Rollo, pp. 152-161.

[3] Section 2, Rule 37, Rules of Court.

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.