

## REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, PETITIONER, VS. HON. FLORENDO P. AQUINO, JUDGE OF THE COURT OF FIRST INSTANCE OF NUEVA ECIJA AND JOHN LI KAN WA, RESPONDENTS.

*G.R. No. L-32779. May 25, 1979*

Ponente: DE CASTRO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/9c7ad52ab15c/>

---

### DE CASTRO, J.:

This is a petition for review of the decision dated September 9, 1970 of the Court of First Instance of Nueva Ecija, Cabanatuan City, granting the petition of John Li Kan Wa for change of name.

Records disclose that John Li Kan Wa filed a petition for change of his name to John Sotto, alleging (a) change of his status from Chinese to Filipino as a result of his election of Filipino Citizenship; and (b) the previous confusion resulting from being registered as John Li Kan Wa and using a different name since childhood which is John Sotto. Finding the petition sufficient in substance, the court issued an order giving notice to all interested parties to appear before the court and state their objections, and directed that the order be published in the Monday Post, a newspaper of general circulation in the province of Nueva Ecija and Cabanatuan City. The Republic filed an opposition to the petition.

After due hearing, the court granted the petition for change of name; hence, the instant petition for review, filed by the Republic, thru the Solicitor General, present-ing the following for resolution:

- (a) Whether or not respondent judge had acquired jurisdiction to hear the petition filed by John Li Kan Wa.
- (b) Whether or not respondent Li Kan Wa has presented a proper and reasonable cause for the change of name.

We find merit in the petition. Under Section 2, Rule 103 of the New Rules of Court, the petition for change shall set forth inter alia, the name asked for. The requirement is mandatory and compliance therewith is essential, for it is by such means that the court acquires jurisdiction. It was held in *Republic vs. Reyes*,<sup>[1]</sup> that failure to include the name sought to be adopted in the title of the petition, and consequently in the notices published in newspapers is a substantial jurisdictional infirmity. As enunciated in *Go Chiu Beng vs. Republic*,<sup>[2]</sup> for publication to be effective, it must give a correct information. To inform, the publication should recite, among others, the following facts: (a) the name or names of applicant; (b) the cause for which the change of name is sought; and (c) the new name asked for.

In *Ng Yao Siong vs. Republic*,<sup>[3]</sup> the rationale of the requirement to include in the title of the petition the name sought to be adopted was expressly made clear, thus:

"xxx Notices in the newspaper, like the one under consideration, usually appears in the back pages. The reader as is to be expected, merely glances at the title of the petition. It is only after he has satisfied himself that the title interests him that he proceeds to read down further. The probability that the portion heretofore quoted will escape the reader's notice. The purpose of which the publication is made, that is, to inform, may thus be served."

It appears from respondent's exhibits 3-A and 3-B that only the name Li Kan Wa was given in the title, and the name John Sotto was not mentioned. Omission in the title of the petition of the name asked for is fatal, and the court did not acquire jurisdiction over the case. Noncompliance with the rules did not vest the court with authority to act on the petition and therefore, the questioned decision is null and void.

In view of the conclusion reached, there is no further need to pass upon the other issue as to whether or not respondent presented a reasonable or compelling cause for change of name.

WHEREFORE, the decision dated September 9, 1970 is hereby annulled and set aside and without prejudice to the amendment of the petition, and further proper proceedings thereafter as prescribed by law.

No costs.

**SO ORDERED.**

Teehankee, (Chairman), Makasiar, Guerrero, and Melencio-Herrera, JJ., concur.  
Fernandez, J., took no part.

---

[1] L-29850, June 30, 1972, 45 SCRA 570.

[2] L-29574, August 18, 1972, 46 SCRA 617.

[3] L-20306, March 31, 1966, 16 SCRA 483.

**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.