

THE HEIRS OF JOSE JUANITE (NAMELY: NICOLASA OSLOB VDA. DE JUANITE, FE JUANITE HEINEN, LUZ JUANITE LAM, HOMER JUANITE, THELMA JUANITE REDOBLE, MAMERTO JUANITE, HERMINIO JUANITE, ...

G.R. No. 138016. January 30, 2002

Ponente: PARDO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-138016/>

PARDO, J.:

The Case

Appeal via certiorari from the decision[1] of the Court of Appeals upholding the ruling of the Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board (DARAB) that the petitioners were not de jure tenants on the subject landholding, and hence, had no right of redemption.

The Facts

The facts, as found by the Court of Appeals, are as follows:

“The spouses Edilberto Romero and Felisa Romero owned a piece of agricultural land in Alegria, Surigao del Norte. On different dates, the Romeros sold separate portions thereof to Efren Pania, Macario Sanchez and Pio Yonson.

“Claiming to be the agricultural tenants of the land in question, Jose Juanite (now deceased) and his wife, Nicolasa O. Juanite, filed a complaint with the Provincial Agricultural Reform Adjudication Board (PARAB), Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR), against the spouses Edilberto and Felisa Mercado and their vendees above-named for the cancellation of the sales adverted to and for the Juanites to exercise their right of redemption pursuant to RA No. 3844,[2] section 12 of which reads:

‘Sec. 12. Lessee’s Right of Redemption. – In case the landholding is sold to a third person without the knowledge of the agricultural lessee, the latter shall have the right to redeem the same at a reasonable price and consideration: Provided, That the entire landholding sold must be redeemed: Provided, further, That where there are two or more agricultural lessees, each shall be entitled to said right of redemption only to the extent of the area actually cultivated by him. The right of redemption under this Section may be exercised within two years from the registration of the sale, and shall have priority over any other right of legal redemption.’

“Edilberto Romero, et al., as defendants, filed their answer with special and affirmative defenses. They alleged that the Romeros, being the owners of the property, had the perfect right to sell any portion thereof to any person. They strongly denied the allegation of the Juanites that the latter were their tenants.

“On October 28, 1993, the PARAB rendered his decision declaring the Juanite spouses as tenants; directing the Municipal Agrarian Reform Officer (MARO) to prepare the leasehold contract in their favor; declaring the deeds of sale executed by the Romero spouses in favor of Efren Pania, Macario Sanchez and Pio Yonson null and void; and directing the latter to vacate the premises.

“On appeal, the DARAB reversed. In its decision dated April 21, 1998, it declared that the Juanites were not tenants on the subject landholding; and hence, had no right of redemption.”[3]

On September 7, 1998, petitioners filed with the Court of Appeals a petition for review of the DARAB ruling.[4]

On February 23, 1999, the Court of Appeals promulgated a decision dismissing the petition.[5]

Hence, this appeal.[6]

The Issue

The primordial issue in this appeal is whether the petitioners were tenants of the Romero spouses (respondents) as to entitle them to the right of redemption.[7]

The Court’s Ruling

We grant the petition. Although the issue raised is factual, and ordinarily may not be reviewed on certiorari, because of conflicting findings of the DARAB upheld by the Court of Appeals, and the Provincial Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board (PARAB) on the issue of tenancy, we are obliged to review the findings of the Court of Appeals.[8]

The PARAB declared the petitioners to be tenants on the basis of the following evidence:

a)

certification of 28 persons to the effect that spouses Juanite had been working on the land as tenants;

b)

in the deed of absolute sale signed by Edilberto Romero as vendor, he stated that spouses Juanite were his tenants;

c)

the spouses Juanite had been in possession and cultivating the land since 1969.

Without any evidence to support its finding, the DARAB reversed the finding of the PARAB and found that petitioner Juanites were not tenants because they failed to submit evidence that they were sharing the harvests of the with the landowners, respondent Romero spouses.

We agree with the Court of Appeals that the essential requisites of a tenancy relationship are:

- (1) the parties are the landowner and the tenant;
- (2) the subject is agricultural land;
- (3) there is consent;
- (4) the purpose is agricultural production;
- (5) there is personal cultivation; and
- (6) there is sharing of harvests.[9]

All these requisites must concur in order to create a tenancy relationship between the parties. The absence of one

does not make an occupant of a parcel of land, or a cultivator thereof, or a planter thereon, a de jure tenant. Unless a person has established his status as a de jure tenant, he is not entitled to security of tenure nor is he covered by the Land Reform Program of the government under existing tenancy laws.[10]

However, we agree with the petitioners that with the landowners' admission that petitioners were tenants on the subject landholding, the element of "sharing harvest" is assumed as a factual element in that admission.[11]

We note that petitioners alleged in the complaint filed with the PARAB that:

"6. That in the year 1971, the herein defendants, informed plaintiffs that the land which, Hermogena Mercado-Mondonedo and which is hereto described, as follows, to wit:

"x x x

and that the land was sold to her and husband, Edilberto Romero by Hermogena Mercado-Mondonedo and that since then, plaintiffs continued in possession and cultivation of the land above described, as tenant and sharing the fruits and products of the land to defendants, spouses Edilberto and Felisa Romero;"[12]

In their answer to the complaint, respondents denied the tenant and landlord relationship,[13] but failed to rebut the evidence adduced by petitioners that they were tenants.

Hence, the DARAB erred in reversing this finding of the PARAB.

The Fallo

IN VIEW WHEREOF, we REVERSE the decision of the Court of Appeals,[14] REVIVE and AFFIRM the decision of the PARAB.[15]

No costs.

SO ORDERED.

Davide, Jr., C.J., (Chairman), Puno, Kapunan and Ynares-Santiago, JJ., concur.

[1] In CA-G.R. SP No. 48903, promulgated on February 23, 1999. Petition, Annex "A", Rollo, pp. 38-42.

[2] An Act to ordain the Agricultural Land Reform Code and to institute land reforms in the Philippines, etc.

[3] Rollo, pp. 38-42 at pp. 38-40.

[4] CA Rollo, pp. 3-21.

[5] Rollo, pp. 38-42.

[6] Petition filed on May 7, 1999. (Rollo, pp. 11-37). On September 01, 1999, we gave due course to the petition. (Rollo, pp. 78-79).

[7] See Rollo, p. 40.

[8] Social Security System v. Court of Appeals, 348 SCRA 1, 10 [2000].

[9] Victorio v. Court of Appeals, G. R. No. 110012, March 28, 2001.

[10] Cua v. Court of Appeals, 198 SCRA 236, 243 [1991]; Prudential Bank v. Gapultos, 181 SCRA 159, 169 [1990]; Caballes v. Department of Agrarian Reform, 168 SCRA 247, 254 [1988].

[11] Rollo, p. 31.

[12] Petition, Annex “B”,. Rollo, pp. 46-50, at p. 46-47.

[13] Rollo, p. 55.

[14] In CA-G. R. SP No. 48903.

[15] In Reg. Case No. X (01) 012 dated October 28, 1993.

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.