

SPS. MARIO & CORAZON VILLALVA, PETITIONERS, VS. RCBC SAVINGS BANK, RESPONDENT.

G.R. NO. 165661. August 28, 2006

Ponente: PUNO, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-165661/>

PUNO, J.:

This case involves a petition for review on certiorari under Rule 45 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure which seeks to reverse the decision of the Seventh Division of the Court of Appeals in CA–G.R. SP No. 76574.

The facts.

In June 1993, petitioner spouses issued forty-eight (48) checks totaling P547,392.00 to cover installment payments due on promissory notes executed in favor of Toyota, Quezon Avenue (TQA) for the purchase of a '93 Toyota Corolla.[1] The promissory notes were secured by a Chattel Mortgage executed by the petitioner spouses on the vehicle in favor of TQA.[2] Under the Deed of Chattel Mortgage, petitioner spouses were to insure the vehicle against loss or damage by accident, theft and fire, and endorse and deliver the policies to the mortgagor, viz.:

The MORTGAGOR covenants and agrees that he/it will cause the property(ies) hereinabove mortgaged to be insured against loss or damage by accident, theft and fire for a period of one year from date hereof with an insurance company or companies acceptable to the MORTGAGEE in an amount not less than the outstanding balance of the mortgage obligations and that he/it will make all loss, if any, under such policy or policies, payable to the MORTGAGEE or its assigns as its interest may appear and deliver such policy to the MORTGAGEE forthwith. The said MORTGAGOR further covenants and agrees that in default of his/its effecting such insurance and delivering the policies so endorsed to the MORTGAGEE on the day of the execution of this mortgage, the MORTGAGEE may at its option, but without any obligation to do so, effect such insurance for the account of the MORTGAGOR and that any money so disbursed by the MORTGAGEE shall be added to the principal indebtedness, hereby secured and shall become due and payable at the time for the payment of the first installment to be due under the note aforesaid after the date of such insurance and shall bear interest and/or finance charge at the same rate as the principal indebtedness. The MORTGAGOR hereby irrevocably authorizes the MORTGAGEE or its assigns to procure for the account of the MORTGAGOR the insurance coverage every year thereafter until the mortgage obligation is fully paid and any money so disbursed shall be payable and shall bear interest and/or finance charge in the same manner as stipulated in the next preceding sentence. It is understood that MORTGAGEE has no obligation to carry out aforementioned authority to procure insurance for the account of the MORTGAGOR.[3]

On June 22, 1993, the promissory notes and chattel mortgage were assigned to Rizal Commercial Banking Corporation (RCBC).[4] They were later assigned by RCBC to RCBC Savings Bank.[5] In time, all forty-eight (48) checks issued by the petitioner spouses were encashed by respondent RCBC Savings Bank.[6]

The evidence shows that the petitioner spouses faithfully complied with the obligation to insure the mortgaged vehicle from 1993 until 1996.[7] For the period of August 14, 1996 to August 14, 1997,[8] petitioner spouses

procured the necessary insurance but did not deliver the same to the respondent until January 17, 1997.[9] As a consequence, respondent had the mortgaged vehicle insured for the period of October 21, 1996 to October 21, 1997 and paid a P14,523.36 insurance premium.[10] The insurance policy obtained by respondent was later cancelled due to the insurance policy secured by petitioner spouses over the mortgaged vehicle, and respondent bank was reimbursed P10,939.86 by Malayan Insurance Company.[11] The premium paid by respondent bank exceeded the reimbursed amount paid by Malayan Insurance Company by P3,583.50.

On February 10, 1999, respondent sent a letter of demand to the petitioners for P12,361.02 allegedly representing unpaid obligations on the promissory notes and mortgage as of January 31, 1999. In lieu thereof, respondent demanded that petitioner spouses surrender the mortgaged vehicle within five days from notice.[12] The petitioner spouses ignored the demand letter.

On April 5, 1999, respondent, in order to get the '93 Toyota Corolla, filed a complaint for Recovery of Possession with Replevin with the Metropolitan Trial Court of Pasay City, which was raffled to Branch 45 thereof.[13] Two weeks later, or on April 19, 1999, the respondent caused the enforcement of a writ of replevin and recovered possession of the mortgaged vehicle.[14] On June 18, 1999, petitioner spouses filed their Answer with Compulsory Counterclaim for moral damages, exemplary damages and attorney's fees.[15] Petitioners asserted that they insured the mortgaged vehicle in compliance with the Deed of Chattel Mortgage.

On June 28, 2002, the Metropolitan Trial Court rendered a decision in favor of petitioners and ordered respondent to pay petitioner spouses P100,000.00 in moral damages, P50,000.00 in exemplary damages, P25,000.00 in attorney's fees, and the costs and expenses of litigation.[16] Respondent's Motion for Reconsideration was denied on September 16, 2002.[17]

Respondent appealed the decision to the Regional Trial Court of Pasay City on October 3, 2002.[18] The case was raffled to Branch 114. On March 21, 2003, the Regional Trial Court affirmed the judgment of the Metropolitan Trial Court in toto.[19]

Undaunted, the respondent filed a petition for review with the Court of Appeals, pursuant to Rule 42 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure, assailing the March 21, 2003 decision of the Regional Trial Court.[20] On July 8, 2004, the Court of Appeals reversed the decision of the Regional Trial Court. It ordered petitioner spouses to pay respondent P3,583.50 within thirty days of finality of the decision, and issued a writ of replevin as regards the mortgaged vehicle.[21] Petitioners' Motion for Reconsideration was denied, hence, the present petition for certiorari.

The petitioners alleged that in ruling against them, the Court of Appeals erred when it failed to consider two pieces of evidence: (1) an Acknowledgment Receipt dated January 17, 1997, which shows that the premium for the second insurance policy had been refunded to the respondent bank; and (2) an Endorsement by the Malayan Insurance Company dated June 11, 1997, which shows that petitioners handed the required insurance policy to the respondent. The petitioners also point out that the respondent was furnished a copy of the insurance policy on January 17, 1997.[22]

On the other hand, respondent contends that petitioners seek a review of factual findings which the Supreme Court cannot do as it is not a trier of facts.[23] It further argues that no reversible errors were made by the Court of Appeals, and to set aside its decision would result in the unjust enrichment of the petitioners.[24]

We rule for the petitioners.

The key issue is whether petitioners failed to comply with their obligation to insure the subject vehicle under the Deed of Chattel Mortgage. The Deed of Chattel Mortgage requires that the petitioners (1) secure the necessary

insurance and (2) deliver the policies so endorsed to the respondent on the day of the execution of this mortgage.

We hold that petitioners did not default in the performance of their obligation. As a rule, demand is required before a party may be considered in default.[25] However, demand by a creditor is not necessary in order that delay may exist: (1) when the obligation or the law expressly so declares; (2) when from the nature and the circumstances of the obligation it appears that the designation of the time when the thing is to be delivered or the service is to be rendered was a controlling motive for the establishment of the contract; or (3) when demand would be useless, as when the obligor has rendered it beyond his power to perform. None of the exceptions are present in this case. It is clear from the records that the first and third exceptions are inapplicable. The second exception cannot also be applied in light of our ruling in *Servicewide Specialists, Incorporated v. Court of Appeals*.[26] In that case, this Court observed that the Deed of Chattel Mortgage required that two conditions should be met before the mortgagee could secure the required insurance: (1) default by the mortgagors in effecting renewal of the insurance, and (2) failure to deliver the policy with endorsement to mortgagee. The mortgagee contended that notice was not required due to the nature of the obligation, and that it was entitled to renew the insurance for the account of the mortgagors without notice to the latter should the mortgagors fail to renew the insurance coverage. To substantiate its claim, the mortgagee relied on the Chattel Mortgage provision that the car be insured at all times. This Court rebuffed the mortgagee's arguments:

If petitioner was aware that the insurance coverage was inadequate, why did it not inform private respondent about it? After all, since petitioner was under no obligation to effect renewal thereof, it is but logical that it should relay to private respondents any defect of the insurance coverage before itself assuming the same.[27]

Due to the mortgagee's failure to notify the mortgagors prior to application of the latter's payments to the insurance premiums, this Court held that the mortgagors had not defaulted on their obligation to secure insurance over the mortgaged vehicle, and affirmed the Regional Trial Court's decision dismissing the mortgagee's complaint for replevin.

In the case at bar, the respondent failed to demand that petitioners comply with their obligation to secure insurance coverage for the mortgaged vehicle. Following settled jurisprudence, we rule that the petitioners had not defaulted on their obligation to insure the mortgaged vehicle and the condition *sine qua non* for respondent to exercise its right to pay the insurance premiums over the subject vehicle has not been established.

The respondent further contends that its payment of the insurance premiums on behalf of the petitioners unjustly enriched the latter. Respondent adverts to the provisions on quasi-contractual obligations in the New Civil Code.[28] Enrichment consists of every patrimonial, physical or moral advantage, so long as it is appreciable in money. It may also take the form of avoidance of expenses and other indispensable reductions in the patrimony of a person. It may also include the prevention of a loss or injury.[29] In the case at bar, petitioner spouses were not enriched when respondent obtained insurance coverage for the mortgaged vehicle as the petitioner spouses had already obtained the required insurance coverage for the vehicle from August 14, 1996 to August 14, 1997.[30]

Finally, we are aware of the rule that findings of fact of the Court of Appeals are given great weight by this Court. Nevertheless, it is this Court's duty to carefully review factual findings where the appreciation of the appellate court and the trial court differ from each other. In the case at bar, the findings of the appellate court are clearly not borne out by the evidence of the parties and necessarily, we have to reject to them.

IN VIEW WHEREOF, the petition is GRANTED. The decision of the Seventh Division of the Court of Appeals promulgated on July 8, 2004 and its resolution promulgated on September 28, 2004 are REVERSED and SET ASIDE. The June 28, 2002 decision and September 16, 2002 resolution of the Metropolitan Trial Court, Pasay City, Branch 45, as well as the March 21, 2003 decision of the Regional Trial Court, Pasay City, Branch 114, are

REINSTATED.

No costs.

SO ORDERED.

Sandoval-Gutierrez, Azcuna and Garcia, JJ., concur. Corona, J., on leave

[1] Rollo, p. 18.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Rollo, p. 53.

[4] Rollo, p. 18; CA rollo, p. 61.

[5] Rollo, p. 143.

[6] Rollo, p. 18.

[7] Rollo, p. 143.

[8] CA rollo, p. 37.

[9] Rollo, p. 21; CA rollo, p. 165.

[10] Rollo, p. 21; CA rollo, pp. 39-40.

[11] Rollo, p. 21.

[12] CA rollo, p. 132.

[13] CA rollo, pp. 53-56.

[14] Rollo, p. 137.

[15] CA rollo, pp. 63-67.

[16] Rollo, pp. 27-30.

[17] CA rollo, p. 96.

[18] CA rollo, pp. 96-97.

[19] Rollo, pp. 31-35.

[20] CA rollo, pp. 2-13.

[21] Rollo, pp. 17-23.

[22] Rollo, pp. 135-137.

[23] Rollo, pp. 144-145.

[24] Rollo, p. 147.

[25] Republic Act No. 386, Article 1169 (1949).

[26] G.R. No. 110597, May 8, 1996, 256 SCRA 649.

[27] Ibid.

[28] Republic Act No. 386, Articles 2142-2143 (1949); V Tolentino, Commentaries and Jurisprudence on the Civil Code of the Philippines, pp. 574-575 (1992).

[29] I Tolentino, Commentaries and Jurisprudence on the Civil Code of the Philippines, p. 78 (1990).

[30] Rollo, p. 21.

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.