

**ROMULO SUMAYAO, DOLORES SUMAYAO-BELMONTE AND
CRISANTA SUMAYAO-FETALVO, PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS, VS.
SALVADOR SUMAYAO, DEFENDANT-APPELLEE.**

Ponente: BRUSELAS, JR. J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/bc59f709c799/>

BRUSELAS, JR. J.:

The record reveals that the appeal filed by the plaintiffs-appellants was granted via our Decision[1] of 18 August 2014 after we found ample bases for the nullity of the deeds of sale executed by Nicolasa Sumayao in favor of defendant-appellee Salvador Sumayao insofar as they cover the undivided interests of the appellants in the exclusive and conjugal properties that were co-owned by them together with the appellee and Nicolasa.

The appellee filed a Motion for Reconsideration[2] of the aforementioned decision asserting that Parcel II represents his share in the estate of his deceased parents. He further asserts that the appellants had been given their respective shares in the estate of their parents through a simulated deed of sale. Anent Parcel IV, the appellee claimed that appellant Romulo Sumayao admitted that said parcel of land was a conjugal property of Nicolasa and Victoriano Sumayao.

The motion lacks persuasion.

We find no cogent reason to warrant a reconsideration of our decision which the appellee seeks to reconsider. The motion has not raised any new, substantial ground or reason that would call for either a reversal or modification of the grant of the appeal. The motion to reconsider our decision does not help at all because the assertions have been considered and discussed when we rendered the decision sought to be reconsidered. To discuss again the ratio decidendi of our decision would be to belabor the issues ad infinitum. In the absence of errors that must be rectified, we cannot give due credence to the motion of the appellee.

WHEREFORE, we DENY the motion for reconsideration.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

PJ Reyes, Jr., A.B., Chairperson and Gaerlan, JJ., concur.

[*] Crisanta Sumayao-Fetalvo should have been removed as party-plaintiff from the case per 7 January 2000 Order of the RTC, Record, Vol. 1, p. 40.

[1] Rollo, p. 75.

[2] Rollo, p. 88.

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.