

FLOR CAÑAS-MANUEL, PETITIONER, VS. ANDRES D. EGANO, RESPONDENT.

G.R. No. 198751. August 19, 2015

Ponente: BRION, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-198751/>

BRION, J.:

We resolve the present petition for review on certiorari[1] assailing the February 18, 2011 Decision[2] and August 31, 2011 Resolution[3] of the Court of Appeals (CA) Cebu City, in CA-G.R. SP No. 03230.

Factual Antecedents

In 2004, respondent Andres D. Egano, together with his spouse Tarcelita, filed with the Department of Agrarian Reform Regional Office (DARRO), Region VIII, Tacloban City, a "Petition for Nullification of Coverage and Disqualification of Farmer-Beneficiary." They contested the issuance of Certificate of Land Ownership Award (CLOA) to and identification as farmer-beneficiaries of petitioner Flor Cañas-Manuel and her sister, Salome D. Cañas, of Lot 3595, Csd. 726-D situated in Barangay Palarao, Leyte, Leyte. He alleged that CLOA No. 00091138 was mistakenly issued to the petitioner and Salome because a portion (an area of 3,655.50 sq.ms. more or less) of the land covered by the said CLOA was previously sold to him by the petitioner's father, Celedonio Cañas.[4] Also, he alleged that the petitioner and Salome were not qualified as farmer-beneficiaries because they were not the actual tillers of the subject portion of land.

In an Order[5] dated October 28, 2004, DAR Regional Director Tiburcio A. Morales, Jr. found merit in the respondent's petition and issued the following:

"WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Petition for Nullification of Coverage under CARP of the portion of lot 3595, situated in Brgy. Palarao, Leyte, Leyte, and Disqualification of its identified Farmer-Beneficiary filed by petitioners (referring to the respondent and his wife) is hereby GRANTED and Order is hereby issued;

1. DECLARING the award in favor of Flor Cañas Manuel and Salome Dellera Cañas of the farmlot embraced by CLOA No. 00091138 null and void ab initio;
2. DIRECTING the Operations Division of DARPO, Leyte, to conduct delineation survey to determine the specific area actually owned and cultivated by the herein petitioners and coordinate with the Bureau of Lands for the correction of the name of farmer-beneficiary in its approved subdivision plan;
3. ORDERING the MARO, DAR Municipal Office of Leyte, Leyte, to identify and document petitioners as the rightful farmer beneficiaries of such portion, subject of this petition;
4. ORDERING the Petitioners to coordinate with the Legal Division of DARPO, Leyte to file the proper petition with the Adjudication Board for the Cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138."[6] (emphasis supplied)

The petitioner moved to reconsider Dir. Morales's order but her motion was denied.[7]

The October 28, 2004 order of Dir. Morales later became final and executory as no appeal was filed within the

remainder of the fifteen (15)-day filing period.[8]

Pursuant to Dir. Morales's order to coordinate his case with the Legal Division of the Department of Agrarian Reform Provincial Office (DARPO) Leyte, the respondent, on January 24, 2005, filed a "Petition for Cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138" with the Department of Agrarian Reform Adjudication Board (DARAB)-Region VIII. This was docketed as DARAB Case No. R-0800-0042-05.

In a decision[9] dated February 16, 2006, Provincial Agrarian Reform Adjudicator (PARAD) Wilfredo M. Navarra ordered the cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138 and its corresponding Original Certificate of Title (OCT) No. 3324 based on Dir. Morales's October 28, 2004 order. The petitioner moved to reconsider PARAD Navarra's decision but her motion was denied in a resolution[10] dated May 8, 2006. The petitioner filed an appeal with the DARAB Central Office in Diliman, Quezon City. This was docketed as DARAB Case No. 14579.

In a decision[11] dated May 29, 2007, the DARAB dismissed the petitioner's appeal, in this wise:

"The appeal is without merit. The cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138 under Original Certificate of Title No. 3324 was an offshoot of the Decision dated October 28, 2004, rendered by the Regional Director of Region VIII, in the case entitled "In Re: Petition for Nullification of Coverage and Disqualification of Farmer-Beneficiary," filed by petitioner (referring to the present respondent). As correctly stated by the Adjudicator a quo: Thus, the declaration of Dir. Tiburcio A. Morales, Jr., regarding the disqualification of Flor Manuel Cañas and Salome D. Cañas as farmer-beneficiaries, is an exercise of an authority of the DAR Secretary that has been delegated to him. The cancellation of the subject CLOA is a necessary consequence of that declaration which binds this office, being an adjunct of the DAR. xxx And in the meantime that the off-mentioned Order of Dir. Tiburcio Morales, has not been vacated or ordered vacated by an appropriate authority, it is incumbent upon this Office to honor the same." [12] (emphases supplied)

The DARAB, likewise, denied the petitioner's motion for reconsideration in a resolution[13] dated October 9, 2007. The petitioner appealed her case to the CA through a Petition for Review filed under Rule 43 of the Rules of Court.

In the decision now assailed before this Court,[14] the CA affirmed in toto the DARAB's decision in DARAB Case No. 14579, stating that:

"As correctly enunciated by DAR Provincial Adjudicator Wilfredo M. Navarra, the objections of herein petitioner to the cancellation of the subject CLOA as the same is a violation of their right to due process, the illegality of the sale of the land, the irregularity of the certificate of finality, etc., cannot be entertained by the DARAB because these are questions related to the administrative implementation of agrarian laws which are beyond the DARAB's jurisdiction. DARAB has no appellate jurisdiction over acts of DAR Regional Directors, thus, petitioners (sic) should have addressed their concerns to the DAR Secretary. xxx

xxx xxx xxx

xxx it is clear that the DARAB did not err in ruling against herein petitioner as it has no authority to grant the reliefs she has prayed for. Moreover, it cannot be argued that Section 1(f) of the Rules vests the DARAB with jurisdiction over cases involving the issuance of Certificates of Land Transfer (CLT) and the administrative correction thereof, as it has been ruled that for the DARAB to exercise jurisdiction in such cases, there must be an agrarian dispute between the landowner and the tenant which is not so in the instant case." [15] (emphases supplied and citations omitted)

In its August 31, 2011 resolution, the CA denied the motion for reconsideration filed by the petitioner; hence, the petitioner's filing of the present petition for review on certiorari with this Court.

The Petition

The petitioner assails the CA's decision for denying his petition for review based on purely technical reasons and ignoring the crucial, substantive issues she presented in her appeal. She contends that the CA committed reversible error when it ruled that the October 28, 2004 order of Dir. Morales could no longer be disturbed, and argues that the said order cannot attain finality because it is illegal, null and void.

The petitioner claims: that, in May 1985, she was identified as a qualified farmer-beneficiary of a 3,895 sq.m.-farm lot in Brgy. Palarao, Leyte, Leyte, originally owned by her parents Celedonio and Floriana Cañas, and designated as Lot No. 3592, Cad. 726-D; that, on November 17, 1986, the lot's Survey Plan was approved after a survey conducted on the property in December 1985; that, on May 31, 1993, she was issued a Certificate of Land Ownership Award No. 00091138 and Original Certificate of Title (OCT) No. OC- 3324, embodied in one (1) document that was registered with the Register of Deeds, Province of Leyte, on June 30, 1993; and that she had been cultivating the land and paying the taxes due on the property ever since.[16] Thus, the petitioner firmly insists that the October 28, 2004 order of Dir. Morales, which was adopted by the DARAB (Region VIII and Central Offices) and later sustained by the CA, was erroneous and patently illegal for the reasons outlined below:

Procedurally, the filing of the respondent's petition for nullification of coverage (and disqualification of farmer-beneficiary) with the DARRO was already barred by prescription as it was filed after the lapse of eleven (11) years since the registration of CLOA No. 00091138 with the Register of Deeds. The respondent's petition too, was a prohibited collateral attack on her title over the subject property.

On substantive issues, the subject portion of land purportedly sold by the petitioner's father to the respondent is not the actual lot referred to in the petitioner's CLOA. CLOA No. 00091138 issued to the petitioner covered Lot No. 3592, and not Lot No. 3595 as claimed by the respondent.

Also, Dir. Morales exceeded his authority when he ruled that the respondent had validly acquired ownership over the subject portion of Lot No. 3595 from the petitioner's parents, as the authority to rule on the issue of the lot's ownership rests with the courts of law.

Lastly, even assuming that the alleged sale between the respondent and the petitioner's father had actually transpired, the sale of the subject portion of Lot No. 3595 to the respondent was a prohibited act under Section 73(e)[17] of Republic Act (R.A.) No. 6657[18] and, thus, cannot serve as the basis for the petitioner's disqualification as farmer-beneficiary and for the cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138 and OCT No. OC-3324 issued to the petitioner.

The petitioner further contends that even the filing of the respondent's petition for cancellation of the CLOA with the DARAB was also time-barred and that said petition, likewise, constituted a prohibited collateral attack to her certificate of title.

In a resolution[19] dated November 14, 2011, this Court required the respondent to file his comment.

In his comment,[20] the respondent counter-argues that the present petition for review on certiorari suffers a procedural infirmity that warrants its outright dismissal. He claims that the petitioner failed to furnish him copies of the annexes mentioned in his petition, particularly pertaining to copies of the October 28, 2004 order of Dir. Morales, and the decisions of PARAD Navarra and the DARAB Central Office.[21] He posits that the October 28, 2004 order of Dir. Morales is a legal and binding order, which had already become final and executory and thus could no longer be reviewed.

The petitioner, in his reply[22] to the respondent's comment, denies that the respondent was not furnished copies of the annexes of her petition. She alleges that, in any case, the annexes to the present petition were the same attachments to her petition for review with the C A, of which the respondent was previously furnished copies.

OUR RULING

We find MERIT in the petition.

While a Rule 45 petition must generally be confined to questions of law, we shall resolve the present petition, which substantially raises questions of fact as we find glaring procedural and substantive errors committed and overlooked by the DARAB and the CA in this case. Thus, we find it imperative to review the facts of the case and the proceedings before the DARAB, including those before the DARRO.

We recall that the respondent's petition before the DARRO was denominated as a "petition for nullification of coverage (from the CARP) and disqualification as farmer-beneficiary" of the petitioner and her sister Salome over Lot No. 3595, csd. 726-D, and included, in the respondent's prayer for reliefs, the cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138 for being null and void.[23]

In his October 28, 2004 order, Dir. Morales granted the respondent's petition and declared CLOA No. 00091138 null and void because:

"From the foregoing, petitioners (referring to the respondent and his wife), acquired ownership over the 3,655.50 sq.m. portion of lot 3595 from Sps. Celedonio and Floriana Cañas, by virtue of a Deed of Absolute Sale. Field verification revealed that since February 6, 1993, petitioners took possession of such contested portion, introduced some permanent improvements thereon, and personally cultivated the same up to the present. This fact substantially support petitioners claim that the identification of Flor Cañas Manuel and Salome Dellera Cañas, as farmer beneficiaries of the aforesaid portion was erroneous, since they were not the actual cultivator (sic) of the same. Neither were said FB's be considered as rightful claimants and owners of said portion, because the same was sold to the herein petitioners by their deceased parents, xxx"[24]

But, instead of ordering the cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138, Dir. Morales ordered the respondent to coordinate with the DARPO-Leyte Legal Division for the filing of the "proper petition" for cancellation with the Adjudication Board.

On January 24, 2005, almost three (3) months after Dir. Morales's order was issued, the respondent filed a petition to cancel CLOA No. 00091138 with the DARAB Region VIII. The petition was referred to and decided upon by PARAD Wilfredo M. Navarra.

In the proceedings before the PARAD, the petitioner filed objections to the cancellation of her CLOA, and raised issues such as the denial of her right to due process, the illegality of the sale between her father and the respondent, among others. However, the petitioner's objections were not addressed because, according to PARAD Navarra, "these are questions related to the administrative implementation of agrarian laws which are beyond the DARAB's jurisdiction."[25]

Thus, following the orders of Dir. Morales, PARAD Navarra cancelled CLOA No. 00091138 and OCT No. 3324. The petitioner appealed to the DARAB Central Office, which sustained the PARAD's order of cancellation.

Under Section 50[26] of R.A. No. 6657 and Section 17[27] of Executive Order (E.O.) No. 229,[28] the DAR is vested with primary and exclusive jurisdiction, both original and appellate, to determine and adjudicate all matters involving the implementation of agrarian reform.[29] Section 2,[30] Rule I of DAR Administrative Order 03 series of 2003[31] defines, by enumeration, the nature of Agrarian Law Implementation (ALI) cases over which the Regional Director exercises primary jurisdiction,[32] and includes cases arising from or involving the classification and identification of landholdings for CARP coverage (including protests or oppositions thereto and petitions for lifting such coverage), and the classification, identification, inclusion, exclusion, qualification, or disqualification of potential/actual farmer-beneficiaries.

Without ruling on the merits of the PARAD's decision at this point, the PARAD already erred in taking cognizance of and ruling on the respondent's petition for cancellation of CLOA when, in his opinion, the case before him was an agrarian law implementation case that rightfully falls under the DAR's jurisdiction. What PARAD Navarra should have done was to refer back the case to the DARRO in accordance with Section 6, Rule I of DAR Administrative Order 03 series of 2003,[33] which provides:

Section 6. Referral of cases. When a party erroneously files a case under Section 2 hereof before the DARAB, the receiving official shall refer the case to the proper DAR office for appropriate action within five (5) working days after determination that said case is within the jurisdiction of the Secretary. Likewise, when a party erroneously files a case under Section 3 hereof before any office other than the DARAB or its adjudicators, the receiving official shall, within five (5) working days, refer the case to the DARAB or its adjudicators, (emphasis supplied)

The next question for resolution is whether the PARAD correctly considered the respondent's case as an agrarian law implementation case cognizable by the DAR.

Under Section 1[34] of the 2003 DARAB Rules of Procedure, the Rules applicable to the petition for cancellation of CLOA filed by the respondent, the DARAB and its Adjudicators have jurisdiction over cases involving the correction, partition, cancellation, secondary and subsequent issuances of Certificates of Land Ownership Award (CLOAs) and Emancipation Patents (EPs) which are registered with the Land Registration Authority.

While it appears that the CLOA subject of this case has been registered with the Register of Deeds on June 30, 1993,[35] the respondent's petition for cancellation of the petitioner's CLOA does not fall within the DARAB's jurisdiction due to the absence of an agrarian dispute or tenancy relationship between the respondent and the petitioner. Here, both parties claim to be the owners and actual tillers of the subject lot.

An agrarian dispute is defined under Section 3(d) of R.A. No. 6657 as:

(d) Agrarian Dispute refers to any controversy relating to tenurial arrangements, whether leasehold, tenancy, stewardship or otherwise, over lands devoted to agriculture, including disputes concerning farmworkers associations or representation of persons in negotiating, fixing, maintaining, changing or seeking to arrange terms or conditions of such tenurial arrangements.

It includes any controversy relating to compensation of lands acquired under this Act and other terms and conditions of transfer of ownership from landowners to farmworkers, tenants and other agrarian reform beneficiaries, whether the disputants stand in the proximate relation of farm operator and beneficiary, landowner and tenant, or lessor and lessee, (emphasis supplied)

We have ruled that, for the DARAB to have jurisdiction over a case, there must be an agrarian dispute or tenancy relationship existing between the parties.[36]

In these lights, we find that the decisions of PARAD Navarra in DARAB Case No. R-0800-0042-05 and the DARAB in DARAB Case No. 14579 were rendered without authority and jurisdiction, hence, null and void.

Lastly, on the procedural issue raised by the respondent in his comment, we resolve it unfavorably to the respondent by reason of his failure to prove his allegation that he received an incomplete copy of the petitioner's petition. The respondent cannot also argue that he was denied due process considering that the Annexes allegedly missing from his copy of the present petition for review on certiorari, i.e., copies of the October 28, 2004 order of Dir. Morales, and the decisions of PARAD Navarra and the DARAB Central Office, are readily available and known to him, as he was the petitioner on the cases in said annexes.

WHEREFORE, premises considered, we GRANT the present petition and REVERSE and SET ASIDE the

February 18, 2011 Decision and August 31, 2011 Resolution of the Court of Appeals, Cebu City, in CA-G.R. SP No. 03230.

Accordingly, we NULLIFY the Provincial Agrarian Reform Adjudicator's February 16, 2006 decision in DARAB Case No. R-0800-0042-05 and the DARAB's May 29, 2007 decision in DARAB Case No. 14579 for want of jurisdiction. The petition for cancellation of CLOA No. 00091138 filed by the respondent is hereby DISMISSED without prejudice to the filing of a similar petition with the proper forum. Costs against the respondent Andres D. Egano.

SO ORDERED.

Carpio, (Chairperson), Del Castillo, Mendoza, and Leonen, JJ., concur.

[1] Rollo, pp. 3-25.

[2] Penned by CA Associate Justice Edwin D. Sorongon, with Associate Justices Pampio A. Abarintos and Socorro B. Inting, concurring, id. at 58-66.

[3] Id. at 91-92.

[4] As per notarized Deed of Absolute Sale of Real Property executed by Celedonio Q. Cañas (married to Floriana D. Cañas) and Mamerta A. Ibañez as vendors, and Andres Egano, as vendee; Annex 11 of the Petition, id. at 104

[5] Id. at 96-99.

[6] Id. at 97 and 99.

[7] Id. at 8.

[8] As provided under Section 238 of the 2003 Rules for Agrarian Law Implementation Cases.

[9] Rollo, pp. 6, 61.

[10] Id.

[11] Id. at 58.

[12] As quoted in the CA's decision; id. at 61.

[13] Rollo, p. 58.

[14] Supra note 2.

[15] Rollo, p. 65.

[16] Id. at 6-7, 16-17.

[17] Section 73. Prohibited Acts and Omissions. — The following are prohibited:

(a)

The ownership or possession, for the purpose of circumventing the provisions of this Act, of agricultural lands in excess of the total retention limits or award ceilings by any person, natural or juridical, except those under collective ownership by farmer-beneficiaries.

(b)

The forcible entry or illegal detainer by persons who are not qualified beneficiaries under this Act to avail themselves of the rights and benefits of the Agrarian Reform Program.

(c)

The conversion by any landowner of his agricultural land into any non-agricultural use with intent to avoid the application of this Act to his landholdings and to dispossess his tenant farmers of the land tilled by them.

(d)

The willful prevention or obstruction by any person, association or entity of the implementation of the CARP.

(e)

The sale, transfer, conveyance or change of the nature of lands outside of urban centers and city limits either in whole or in part after the effectivity of this Act. The date of the registration of the deed of conveyance in the Register of Deeds with respect to titled lands and the date of the issuance of the tax declaration to the transferee of the property with respect to unregistered lands, as the case may be, shall be conclusive for the purpose of this Act.

(f)

The sale, transfer or conveyance by a beneficiary of the right to use or any other usufructuary right over the land he acquired by virtue of being a beneficiary, in order to circumvent the provisions of this Act. (emphasis supplied)

xxx

[18] AN ACT INSTITUTING A COMPREHENSIVE AGRARIAN REFORM PROGRAM TO PROMOTE SOCIAL JUSTICE AND INDUSTRIALIZATION, PROVIDING THE MECHANISM FOR ITS IMPLEMENTATION, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law of 1988, approved on June 10, 1988.

[19] Rollo, pp. 106-107.

[20] Dated February 6, 2012, rollo, unpagged.

[21] Respondent's comment, id., unpagged.

[22] Dated February 17, 2012, rollo, unpagged.

[23] Supra note 6.

[24] Rollo, pp. 97-98.

[25] Supra note 15.

[26] SEC. 50. Quasi-Judicial Powers of the DAR. The DAR is hereby vested with primary jurisdiction to determine and adjudicate agrarian reform matters and shall have exclusive original jurisdiction over all matters involving the implementation of agrarian reform, except those falling under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture (DA) and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR).

xxxx

[27] SEC. 17. Quasi-Judicial Powers of the DAR. The DAR is hereby vested with quasi-judicial powers to determine and adjudicate agrarian reform matters, and shall have exclusive original jurisdiction over all matters involving implementation of agrarian reform, except those falling under the exclusive original jurisdiction of the

DENR and the Department of Agriculture (DA).

xxxx

[28] PROVIDING THE MECHANISMS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE AGRARIAN REFORM PROGRAM, approved on July 22, 1987.

[29] Islanders CARP-Farmers Beneficiaries Multi-Purpose Cooperative, Inc. v. Lapanday Agricultural and Devt. Corp., G.R. No. 159089, May 3, 2006, 489 SCRA 80, 85.

[30] Section 2. ALI cases. These Rules shall govern all cases arising from or involving:

2.1.

Classification and identification of landholdings for coverage under the agrarian reform program and the initial issuance of Certificate of Land Ownership Awards (CLOAs) and Emancipation Patents (EPs), including protests or oppositions thereto and petitions for lifting such coverage;

2.2.

Classification, identification, inclusion, exclusion, qualification, or disqualification of potential/actual farmer-beneficiaries;

2.3.

Subdivision surveys of land under Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program (CARP);

2.4.

Recall, or cancellation of provisional lease rentals, Certificates of Land Transfers (CLTs) and CARP Beneficiary Certificates (CBCs) in cases outside the purview of Presidential Decree (PD) No. 816, including the issuance, recall or cancellation of Emancipation Patents (EPs) or Certificates of Land Ownership Awards (CLOAs) not yet registered with the Register of Deeds;

2.5.

Exercise of the right of retention by landowner;

2.6.

Application for exemption from coverage under Section 10 of RA 6657;

2.7.

Application for exemption pursuant to Department of Justice (DOJ) Opinion No. 44 (1990);

2.8.

Exclusion from CARP coverage of agricultural land used for livestock, swine, and poultry raising;

2.9.

Cases of exemption/exclusion of fishpond and prawn farms from the coverage of CARP pursuant to RA 7881;

2.10.

Issuance of Certificate of Exemption for land subject of Voluntary Offer to Sell (VOS) and Compulsory Acquisition (CA) found unsuitable for agricultural purposes;

2.11.

Application for conversion of agricultural land to residential, commercial, industrial, or other non-agricultural uses and purposes including protests or oppositions thereto;

2.12.

Determination of the rights of agrarian reform beneficiaries to homelots;

2.13.

Disposition of excess area of the tenant's/farmer-beneficiary's landholdings;

2.14.

Increase in area of tillage of a tenant-farmer beneficiary;

2.15.

Conflict of claims in landed estates administered by DAR and its predecessors; and

2.16.

Such other agrarian cases, disputes, matters or concerns referred to it by the Secretary of the DAR. (emphases supplied).

xxxx

[31] Also known as the "2003 Rules for Agrarian Law Implementation Cases," dated January 16, 2003.

[32] Section 7, Rule II of the 2003 Rules for Agrarian Law Implementation Cases states that:

"Section 7. General Jurisdiction. The Regional Director shall exercise primary jurisdiction over all agrarian law implementation cases except when a separate special rule vests primary jurisdiction in a different DAR Office."

[33] Supra note 30.

[34] SECTION 1. Primary and Exclusive Original Jurisdiction. - The Adjudicator shall have primary and exclusive original jurisdiction to determine and adjudicate the following cases:

1.1.

The rights and obligations of persons, whether natural or juridical, engaged in the management, cultivation, and use of all agricultural lands covered by Republic Act (RA) No. 6657, otherwise known as the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Law (CARL), and other related agrarian laws;

1.2.

The preliminary administrative determination of reasonable and just compensation of lands acquired under Presidential Decree (PD) No. 27 and the Comprehensive Agrarian Reform Program;

1.3.

The annulment or cancellation of lease contracts or deeds of sale or their amendments involving lands under the administration and disposition of the DAR or Land Bank of the Philippines (LBP);

1.4.

Those cases involving the ejectment and dispossession of tenants and/or leaseholders;

1.5.

Those cases involving the sale, alienation, pre-emption, and redemption of agricultural lands under the coverage of the CARL or other agrarian laws;

1.6.

Those involving the correction, partition, cancellation, secondary and subsequent issuances of Certificates of Land Ownership Award (CLOAs) and Emancipation Patents (EPs) which are registered with the Land Registration Authority;

1.7.

Those cases involving the review of leasehold rentals;

1.8.

Those cases involving the collection of amortizations on payments for lands awarded under PD No. 27, as amended, RA No. 3844, as amended, and RA No. 6657, as amended, xxx;

1.9.

Those cases involving the annulment or rescission of lease contracts and deeds of sale, and the cancellation or amendment of titles pertaining to agricultural lands under the administration and disposition of the DAR and LBP, xxx;

1.10.

Those cases involving boundary disputes over lands under the administration and disposition of the DAR and the LBP, xxx;

1.11.

Those cases involving the determination of title to agricultural lands where the issue is raised in an agrarian dispute by any of the parties or a third person in connection with the possession thereof xxx;

1.12.

Those cases previously falling under the original and exclusive jurisdiction of the defunct Court of Agrarian Relations under Section 12 of PD No. 946 xxx; and

1.13.

Such other agrarian cases, disputes, matters or concerns referred to it by the Secretary of the DAR. (emphasis supplied)

xxxx

[35] Attached to the Rollo is a certified true copy of OCT No. OC-3324 pertaining to the award of a 3,895 sq.m.-lot in Barangay Palara, Municipality of Leyte, Province of Leyte, to Flor Cañas-Manuel, et al. under CLOA No. 0001138, issued on May 31, 1993, and registered with the Registry of Deeds of the Province of Leyte on June 30, 1993; rollo, p. 93.

[36] See *Charles Bumagat, et al. v. Regalado Arribay*, G.R. No. 194818, June 9, 2014; *Del Monte Philippines, Inc. Employees Agrarian Reform Beneficiaries Cooperative (DEARBC) v. Jesus Sanguinay, et al.*, 656 Phil. 97

(2011); Heirs of Rafael Magpily v. De Jesus, 511 Phil. 14 (2005).

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.