

CRISOLOGO C. DOMINGO, PETITIONER, VS. SEVERINO AND RAYMUNDO LANDICHO, JULIAN ABELLO, MARTA DE SAGUN AND EDITHA G. SARMIENTO, RESPONDENTS.

G.R. NO. 170015. August 29, 2007

Ponente: CARPIO MORALES, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-170015/>

CARPIO MORALES, J.:

Crisologo C. Domingo (Domingo) filed on April 20, 1993 with the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Tagaytay City an application for registration,[1] docketed as LRC No. TG-451, of five parcels of land delineated as Lot Nos. 7513, 7515, 7516, 7517 and 7518, Cad. 355 under Approved Survey Plan AS-04-002475[2] (the lots).

The lots, which are located at Barangay Tolentino, Tagaytay, have a total land area of 38,975 square meters.

In his application, Domingo claimed that he bought the lots from Genoveva Manlapit (Genoveva) in 1948 and has since been in continuous, open, public, adverse and uninterrupted possession thereof in the concept of an owner.

Domingo further claimed that prior to his purchase of the lots, Genoveva had been in possession thereof in the concept of an owner for more than 30 years.[3]

To Domingo's application the following documents were attached:

- Tracing Cloth of Approved Plan AS-04-002475 (surveyed from September 24, 1963 to February 13, 1964 and approved on December 12, 1990).[4]
- Photocopy of the Technical Description of Lot Nos. 7513, 7515, 7516, 7517, and 7518.[5]
- Photocopy of the Geodetic Engineer's Certificate.[6]
- Owner's Copy of Tax Declaration Nos. GR-019-0893-R (covering Lot 7513), GR-019-0894-R (covering Lot 7515), GR-019-0895-R (covering Lot 7516), GR-019-0896-R (covering Lot 7517), GR-019-0897-R (covering Lot 7518), all dated January 7, 1993 and in the name of Crisologo C. Domingo.[7]
- Land Management Inspector's 2nd Indorsement dated October 22, 1990 recommending approval of AS-Plan.[8]

The Land Registration Authority (LRA), which filed before the RTC its Report[9] dated September 27, 1993, stated that after plotting Plan AS-04-002475 in the Municipal Index Sheet thru its tie lines, a discrepancy was noted. The RTC thus referred the matter to the Lands Management Sector, Region IV for verification and correction.

Acting on the directive of the RTC, the Director of Lands filed a Report that "per records of the Lands Management Bureau in Manila, the land involved in said case was not covered by any land patent or by public land application pending issuance of patent." [10]

The LRA later filed a Supplementary Report[11] dated December 22, 1993 stating that:

x x x x

- The Regional Technical Director, Region Office IV, thru the Chief, Surveys Division, Robert C. Pangyarihan in his letter dated November 22, 1993, a copy is attached hereto as Annex "A", informed that per records on file in that Office, the correct adjoining survey along line 8-9 of Lot 7516 and along lines 3-4-5 of Lot 7515 should be Lot 9237 Cad-355, covered by As-04-000091 and that the parcel of land covered by As-04-002475 are not portions of or identical to any previously approved isolated survey; and

- When the above-furnished correction was applied on plan As-04-002475 no more discrepancy exists.

x x x x

On November 26, 1993, herein respondents Severino and Raymundo Landicho, Julian Abello, Marta de Sagun, and Editha G. Sarmiento filed an Answer/Opposition[12] to Domingo's application, claiming that they have been in open, continuous, adverse and actual possession and cultivation of the lots in the concept of an owner and have been paying real estate taxes thereon;[13] and that Survey Plan AS-04-002475 was lifted from the cadastral survey of the government which was surveyed for them and other individual owners.[14]

During the pendency of his application or on March 9, 1996, Domingo died. His counsel, Atty. Irineo Anarna, did not, however, inform the RTC of his death.

By Decision[15] of December 22, 1997, the RTC approved Domingo's application for registration, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, in the light of the foregoing premises and considerations, this Court hereby renders judgment approving the instant application for registration and thus places under the operation of Act 141, Act 496 and/or P.D. 1529, otherwise known as the Property Registration Law, the lands described in Plan AS-04-002475 as Lots 7513, 7515, 7516, 7517 and 7518, Cad-355, Tagaytay Cadastre, containing an area of 10,519 square meters, 3, 956 square meters, 18, 921 square meters, 3, 985 square meters and 1, 594 square meters, respectively, as supported by their technical descriptions now forming parts of the records of this case, in addition to other proofs adduced, in the name of CRISOLOGO C. DOMINGO, Filipino, of legal age, married to Corazon A. Domingo, and with residence at No. 34 Dao St., Project 3, Quezon City, Metro Manila.

Once this decision becomes final and executory, the corresponding decree of registration shall forthwith issue.

SO ORDERED.[16]

Respondents appealed to the Court of Appeals, contending that contrary to Domingo's claim that he and his predecessors-in-interest have been in actual, continuous and uninterrupted possession of the lots, Domingo has always been a resident of No. 34 Dao St., Project 3, Quezon City; that despite Domingo's claim that he has a caretaker overseeing the lots, he could not even give the name of the caretaker; and that Domingo admittedly declared the lots in his name only in 1993.

By Decision[17] of June 30, 2005, the Court of Appeals reversed and set aside the RTC decision and dismissed Domingo's application for registration of land title.

The appellate court ruled that while Domingo sought judicial confirmation of his imperfect title under the Public Land Act and Section 14 (1) of Presidential Decree (P.D.) No. 1529, "THE PROPERTY REGISTRATION DECREE," he failed to prove that he and his predecessors-in-interest had been in possession and occupation of the lots under a bona fide claim of ownership since June 12, 1945 or earlier.[18]

And the appellate court noted that Domingo failed to present the alleged deed of sale executed by Genoveva[19] and "could only prove through his Tax Declaration No. 0298 (new) that his possession in the concept of an owner

started only in 1948 (Exhibit 'L,' Records, p. 117)."

Domingo's Motion for Reconsideration having been denied by the appellate court, the present petition was lodged, faulting the appellate court:

I

. . . x x x x WHEN IT LIMITED CONSIDERATION OF THE MATTERS ESTABLISHED IN THE APPLICATION TO SECTION 48 (B) OF THE PUBLIC LAND ACT AND SECTION 14 (1) OF PD 1529.

II

. . . x x x WHEN IT HELD THAT PETITIONER IS NOT ENTITLED FOR REGISTRATION OF TITLE OVER THE SUBJECT LAND, NOTWITHSTANDING THE FACT THAT THE EVIDENCE ON RECORD CLEARLY ESTABLISHED HIS ENTITLEMENT [TO] REGISTRATION OF TITLE OVER THE LAND UNDER SECTION 14 (1) AND (4) OF PD 1529.[20] (Underscoring supplied)

Domingo's present counsel argues that assuming that Domingo failed to establish his possession from June 12, 1945 or earlier in accordance with Section 14(1) of P.D. No. 1529, he is still entitled to registration of title under Article 1113 [21] in relation to Article 1137[22] of the Civil Code.[23]

In their Comment[24] to the present petition, respondents pray for its denial for being substantially defective, Domingo's death not having been alleged, albeit the Verification and Certification against Forum Shopping was signed by Domingo's alleged "Surviving Spouse and Heirs." [25]

To respondents' Comment, Domingo's counsel filed a Reply[26] stating that there is no clearer manifestation of the death of Domingo than the statement under oath of his surviving spouse and heirs "in substitution of deceased CRISOLOGO C. DOMINGO" contained in the Verification and Certification against Forum Shopping which forms part of the present petition.[27] Nonetheless, the counsel presented a certified true copy of Domingo's death certificate[28] showing that he died on March 9, 1996 (during the pendency of his application before the RTC as earlier stated).

The petition is bereft of merit.

Section 14 (1) of P.D. No. 1529 provides:

Sec. 14. Who may apply. - The following persons may file in the proper Court of First Instance an application for registration of title to land, whether personally or through their duly authorized representatives:

(1) Those who by themselves or through their predecessors-in-interest have been in open, continuous, exclusive and notorious possession and occupation of alienable and disposable lands of the public domain under a bona fide claim of ownership since June 12, 1945, or earlier.[29] (Underscoring supplied)

To thus be entitled to registration of a land, the applicant must prove that (a) the land applied for forms part of the disposable and alienable agricultural lands of the public domain; and (b) he has been in open, continuous, exclusive, and notorious possession and occupation of the same under a bona fide claim of ownership either since time immemorial or since June 12, 1945.[30]

All lands not otherwise appearing to be clearly within private ownership are presumed to belong to the State, and unless it has been shown that they have been reclassified by the State as alienable or disposable to a private person, they remain part of the inalienable public domain.[31]

To prove that a land is alienable, an applicant must conclusively establish the existence of a positive act of the government, such as a presidential proclamation or an executive order, or administrative action, investigation

reports of the Bureau of Lands investigator or a legislative act or statute.[32]

While petitioner presented a document denominated as "2[nd] Indorsement"[33] issued by Land Management Inspector Amadeo Mediran that the lots are "within the alienable and disposable zone under Project No. 3 LSC-3113 issued on April 5, 1978 as certified by the Director of the Forest Development," the genuineness of the document cannot be ascertained, it being a mere photocopy. Besides, the truth of its contents cannot be ascertained, Mediran having failed to take the witness stand to identify and testify thereon.

In fine, Domingo failed to adduce incontrovertible evidence[34] showing that the lots have been declared alienable. They are thus presumed to belong to the public domain, beyond the commerce of man, and are not susceptible of private appropriation and acquisitive prescription.

But even assuming arguendo that the lots are alienable, Domingo failed to comply with the requirement on the period of possession. While he alleged in his petition that he bought the lots from Genoveva in 1948, he failed, as the appellate court correctly noted, to adduce the deed of sale executed for the purpose, or to explain the reason behind the failure and to present sufficient evidence to prove the fact of sale.

Again, even assuming arguendo that the lots were indeed sold to him by Genoveva, Domingo failed to adduce proof that Genoveva, from whom he seeks to tack his possession, acquired registrable title over them on June 12, 1945 or earlier. Under the same assumption, Domingo's claim that he has been in actual, continuous, adverse and open possession of the lots in the concept of an owner since 1948 is a conclusion of law which must be substantiated with proof of specific acts of ownership and factual evidence of possession.[35]

An examination of the tax receipts[36] presented by Domingo shows that they are of recent vintage, the earliest being dated January 8, 1993.

Tax Declaration Nos. 0298, GR-019-0884, and GR-019-0885,[37] which appear to have been issued in 1947 [sic], 1964, and 1968, respectively, contain the declaration "Filed under Presidential Decree No. 464" below the title "Declaration of Real Property." P.D. No. 464, "The Real Property Tax Code," took effect, however, only on June 1, 1974. Specifically with respect to the first tax declaration, it even shows that Domingo subscribed and swore to it on August 1, 1947 at which time he had not bought the lot yet, in 1948 by his claim.

A note on Domingo's death during the pendency of his application at the RTC. Indeed, the records do not show that his death on March 9, 1996 was brought to the RTC's attention, which is not in accordance with Sections 16 and 17, Rule 3 of the 1994 Rules of Court, viz:

SEC. 16. Duty of attorney upon death, incapacity, or incompetency of party. - Whenever a party to a pending case dies, becomes incapacitated or incompetent, it shall be the duty of his attorney to inform the court promptly of such death, incapacity or incompetency, and to give the name and residence of his executor, administrator, guardian or other legal representative. (Italics in the original; underscoring supplied)

SEC. 17. Death of party. - After a party dies and the claim is not thereby extinguished, the court shall order, upon proper notice, the legal representative of the deceased to appear and to be substituted for the deceased, within a period of thirty (30) days, or within such time as may be granted. If the legal representative fails to appear within said time, the court may order the opposing party to procure the appointment of a legal representative of the deceased within a time to be specified by the court, and the representative shall immediately appear for and on behalf of the interest of the deceased. The court charges involved in procuring such appointment, if defrayed by the opposing party, may be recovered as costs. The heirs of the deceased may be allowed to be substituted for the deceased, without requiring the appointment of an executor or administrator and the court may appoint guardian ad litem for the minor heirs. (Italics in the original; underscoring supplied)

When a party dies in an action that survives and no order is issued by the court for the appearance of the legal representative or of the heirs of the deceased in substitution of the deceased, and as a matter of fact no substitution has ever been effected, the proceedings held by the court without such legal representatives or heirs and the judgment rendered after such trial are null and void because the court acquired no jurisdiction over the person of the legal representative or of the heirs upon whom the trial and judgment would be binding.[38]

Unlike, however, jurisdiction over the subject matter which is conferred by law, jurisdiction over the person of the parties to the case may, however, be waived either expressly or impliedly.[39] In the case at bar, the surviving heirs voluntarily submitted themselves to the jurisdiction of this Court, albeit belatedly, by participating in the present petition.

Under the now amended Section 16, Rule 3 of the 1997 Rules of Court, failure of a counsel to comply with the provision thereof is a ground for disciplinary action, viz:

SEC. 16. Death of party; duty of counsel. - Whenever a party to a pending action dies, and the claim is not thereby extinguished, it shall be the duty of his counsel to inform the court within thirty (30) days after such death of the fact thereof, and to give the name and address of his legal representative or representatives. Failure of counsel to comply with this duty shall be a ground for disciplinary action.

The heirs of the deceased may be allowed to be substituted for the deceased, without requiring the appointment of an executor or administrator and the court may appoint a guardian ad litem for the minor heirs.

The court shall forthwith order said legal representative or representatives to appear and be substituted within a period of thirty (30) days from notice.

If no legal representative is named by the counsel for the deceased party, or if the one so named shall fail to appear within the specified period, the court may order the opposing party, within a specified time, to procure the appointment of an executor or administrator for the estate of the deceased and the latter shall immediately appear for and on behalf of the deceased. The court charges in procuring such appointment, if defrayed by the opposing party, may be recovered as costs. (*Italics in the original; underscoring supplied*)

The failure of Domingo's former counsel, Atty. Irineo A. Anarna of No. 4 Madlansacay St., Poblacion Lilang 4118 Cavite, to comply with the immediately quoted provisions of the Rules, is compounded by his misrepresentation, before the CA, that Domingo was well and alive when he stated in his Motion to Withdraw Appearance as Counsel[40] dated July 8, 2004 that the "motion for withdrawal [was] conformed to by Mrs. Rosemarie Manlapit Zamora, representative of the applicant as shown by her signature . . . and that Mrs. Rosemarie Zamora also undertakes to personally seek the conformity of the Applicant" (*Underscoring supplied*); and by his retaining of the name of Domingo in the title of his pleadings before the appellate court.

Canon 10 of the Code of Professional Responsibility provides that "a lawyer owes candor, fairness and good faith to the court." Rule 10.01 likewise provides that "a lawyer shall do no falsehood, nor consent to the doing of any in court; nor shall he mislead, or allow the court to be mislead by any artifice." And Rule 10.03 provides that "a lawyer shall observe the rules of procedure and shall not misuse them to defeat the ends of justice."

This Court thus takes this occasion to warn Atty. Anarna that a repetition of a similar violation of the Rules of Court and the Code of Professional Responsibility will be dealt with strictly.

WHEREFORE, the petition is, in light of the foregoing discussion, DENIED.

Let a copy of this Decision be furnished Atty. Irineo A. Anarna of No. 4 Madlansacay St., Poblacion Lilang, 4118 Cavite.

SO ORDERED.

Quisumbing, (Chairperson), Carpio, Tinga, and Velasco, Jr., JJ., concur.

[1] Records, pp. 1-10.

[2] Id. at 11.

[3] Id. at 7.

[4] Id. at 11.

[5] Id. at 12-16.

[6] Id. at 22.

[7] Id. at 17-21.

[8] Id. at 23. The document however refers to Advance Survey Plan of Lot Nos. 7510, 7511, 7512 and 7519, Cad-355 and not to subject lots.

[9] Id. at 48-49.

[10] Id. at 70.

[11] Id. at 76.

[12] Id. at 55-58.

[13] Id. at 57.

[14] Id. at 56-57.

[15] Id. at 221-228.

[16] Id. at 228.

[17] CA rollo, pp. 114-129. The decision was penned by Associate Justice Conrado M. Vasquez, Jr., and concurred by Associate Justices Rebecca De Guia-Salvador and Aurora Santiago Lagman.

[18] Id. at 121-123.

[19] Id. at 123.

[20] Rollo, p. 15.

[21] Article 1113 of the Civil Code reads:

Art. 1113. All things which are within the commerce of men are susceptible of prescription, unless otherwise provided. Property of the State or any of its subdivisions not patrimonial in character shall not be the object of prescription.

[22] Article 1137 of the Civil Code reads:

Art. 1137. Ownership and other real rights over immovables shall prescribe through uninterrupted adverse possession thereof for thirty years, without need of title or of good faith.

[23] Rollo, pp. 22-23.

[24] Id. at 55-57.

[25] Id. at 42.

[26] Id. at 65-69.

[27] Id. at 65.

[28] Id. at 70.

[29] Section 48(b) of Commonwealth Act No. 141 (Public Land Act), as amended by R.A. No. 1942, reads:

Section 48. The following described citizens of the Philippines, occupying lands of the public domain or claiming to own any such lands or an interest therein, but whose titles have not been perfected or completed, may apply to the Court of First Instance of the province where the land is located for confirmation of their claims and the issuance of a certificate of title therefor, under the Land Registration Act, to wit:

x x x x

(b) Those who by themselves or through their predecessors-in-interest have been in open, continuous, exclusive, and notorious possession and occupation of agricultural lands of the public domain, under a bona fide claim of acquisition of ownership, for at least thirty years immediately preceding the filing of the application for confirmation of title except when prevented by war or force majeure. These shall be conclusively presumed to have performed all the conditions essential to a Government grant and shall be entitled to a certificate of title under the provisions of this chapter.

This provision was further amended by P.D. No. 1073 by substituting the phrase "for at least thirty years" with "since June 12, 1945;" thus:

Sec. 4. The provisions of Section 48(b) and Section 48(c), Chapter VIII, of the Public Land Act are hereby amended in the sense that these provisions shall apply only to alienable and disposable lands of the public domain which have been in open, continuous, exclusive and notorious possession, and occupation by the applicant himself or through his predecessor-in-interest, under a bona fide claim of acquisition of ownership, since June 12, 1945.

[30] Republic v. Candy Maker, Inc., G.R. No. 163766, June 22, 2006, 492 SCRA 272, 290.

[31] Id. at 291.

[32] Id. at 292.

[33] Records, p. 23.

[34] Menguito v. Republic, 401 Phil. 274, 287 (2000).

[35] Republic of the Philippines v. Carrasco, G.R. No. 143491, December 6, 2006, 510 SCRA 150, 160.

[36] Records, Exhibits "Z-1" to "Z-5" inclusive, pp. 132-135.

[37] Records, Exhibits "L," "M" and "N," pp. 117-119.

[38] Carandang v. Heirs of De Guzman, G.R. No. 160347, November 29, 2006, 508 SCRA 469, 479-480.

[39] Id. at 479.

[40] CA rollo, pp. 108-109.

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.