

**IN RE: PETITION FOR CORRECTION OF NAME IN THE CIVIL
REGISTRY OF MANILA SATURNINA VDA. DE CASTRO,
PETITIONER-APPELLEE, VS. REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES,
OPPOSITOR-APPELLANT.**

G.R. No. L-28520. January 17, 1985

Ponente: RELOVA, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/91a346040b29/>

RELOVA, J.:

Direct appeal on points of law from a decision of the then Court of First Instance of Manila in Civil Case No. 70128, the dispositive portion of which is as follows:

"Considering all the foregoing, the Court finds the petition to be meritorious and grants the same. The Court declares that Ramon V. Castro, Jr., Ramon George Castro, Jr. and George F. Castro are one and the same person. The Civil Registrar of the City of Manila is ordered to make the correction in the records of the Civil Registry changing the name George F. Castro as appearing therein to that of Ramon V. Castro in the original of the certificate of birth certified photostatic copy of which is now marked as Exhibit B." (p. 21, Record on Appeal)

The foregoing judgment was entered upon petition of Saturnina V. Vda. de Castro, filed in the court aforesaid, praying that an order be issued "declaring that Ramon V. Castro, George F. Castro and Ramon George Castro, Jr., to be the names of one and the same person, namely that of Ramon V. Castro and directing the Civil Registrar of the City of Manila to make the necessary correction in the records of the Civil Registry changing the name of George F. Castro to Ramon V. Castro." (p. 3, Record on Appeal)

Petitioner Saturnina V. Vda. de Castro in her petition alleged that her son Ramon V. Castro was born on August 31, 1946 at St. Luke's Hospital; that said Ramon V. Castro is also known as Ramon George Castro, Jr. in the baptismal certificate and George F. Castro in the birth certificate; that Ramon V. Castro is her child's true and lawful name since childhood affixing said name in all transactions both in private and official documents; and that confusion arose when in choosing the name to be given to Ramon V. Castro upon his birth three names were proposed, namely: Ramon V. Castro, Ramon George Castro, Jr. and George F. Castro, the third name being erroneously recorded in the Civil Registry of Manila.

The court caused copies of the petition to be served on the Solicitor General and the Civil Registrar of Manila. The Republic of the Philippines, through the Solicitor General, opposed the petition claiming that "correction of entries in the civil registry contemplated under Article 412 of the Civil Code refers to clerical mistakes (Ty Kong Tin vs. Republic, L-5609, February 5, 1954). A clerical mistake is one which is visible to the eyes or obvious to the understanding; and error made by a clerk or a clerk or a transcriber; a mistake in copying or writing (Black vs. Republic, L-10869, November 28, 1958; Beduya vs. Republic, No. L-17639, May 29, 1964). Errors in birth certificates which are not clerical in nature cannot be corrected by means of a petition for correction (Lui Lin vs. Republic, No. L-18213, December 24, 1963)." (p. 10, Record on Appeal)

The court a quo declared that upon proof of mistake it did have the power to order the change sought, and did so. Wherefore, the state appealed.

The decision must be reversed. It has been the consistent ruling of this Court since the *Ty Kong Tin vs. Republic*, 94 Phil. 321, "that substantial alterations, such as those affecting the status and citizenship of a person in the Civil Registry Records, can not be ordered by the court unless first threshed out in an 'appropriate action wherein all parties who may be affected by the entries are notified or represented' (see Rule 108 of the Revised Rules of Court), and that the summary proceedings under Article 412 of the Civil Code only justify an order to correct innocuous or clerical errors, such as misspellings and the like, errors that are visible to the eyes or obvious to the understanding (*Baybayan vs. Republic of the Philippines*, 16 SCRA 403)."

In *Lui Lin vs. Nuño*, 9 SCRA 707, this Court said:

"Article 412 of the New Civil Code contemplates mere corrections of mistakes that are clerical in nature, like misspelled names or occupations of the parents, etc., but not those which may affect the civil status, or the nationality or citizenship of the persons involved, for in such cases it is necessary to file the proper action wherein not only the State but also all the parties concerned should be made parties defendants.

"In the case at bar, where it is admitted that the name placed in the certificates of birth is not the name of a different person but the alias name of the petitioner himself and the name of the child was her real name, so that it cannot be contended that a mistake has been committed in giving the information to the local civil registry, while the changes sought for may affect the status of the petitioner or the paternity and filiation of his children, it is held that the lower court erred in granting the petition under Article 412 of the New Civil Code."

Indeed, the mistake in the case at bar is not the mistake or error contemplated under Article 412 of the New Civil Code which justifies the correction of the birth certificate. Article 412 allows correction only of clerical mistakes, not those substantial changes which may affect the identity (a man is identified by his name), personality, civil status or nationality of the persons involved. Thus, errors in birth certificate which are not clerical in nature, as in this case before Us, cannot be corrected by means of a petition for correction.

ACCORDINGLY, the decision appealed from is REVERSED. Costs against petitioner-appellee.

SO ORDERED.

Melencio-Herrera, Plana, and De la Fuente, JJ., concur.

Teehankee, J., (Chairman), no part.

Gutierrez, Jr., J., concur in the results. Under the facts of this case, the proper procedure is for a change of name under Rule 103.

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.