

TEOFILO ALOLINO, PETITIONER, VS. FORTUNATO FLORES AND ANASTACIA MARIE FLORES, RESPONDENTS.*G.R. No. 198774. April 04, 2016*

Ponente: BRION, J.

Read online (full-text search, related cases, audio case brief): <https://batas.org/library/g-r-no-198774/>**BRION, J.:**

This is a petition for review on certiorari filed from the July 8, 2011 decision of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. CV No. 94524.[1] The CA reversed the Regional Trial Court's (RTC) decision[2] in Civil Case No. 69320[3] and dismissed petitioner Teofilo Alolino's complaint against the respondents for the removal of their illegally constructed structure.

Antecedents

Alolino is the registered owner of two (2) contiguous parcels of land situated at No. 47 Gen. Luna Street, Barangay Tuktukan, Taguig, covered by Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) Nos. 784 and 976. TCT No. 784 was issued on August 30, 1976 covering an area of 26 square meters; while TCT No. 976 was issued on August 29, 1977, with an area of 95 square meters.

Alolino initially constructed a bungalow-type house on the property. In 1980, he added a second floor to the structure. He also extended his two-storey house up to the edge of his property. There are terraces on both floors. There are also six (6) windows on the perimeter wall: three (3) on the ground floor and another three (3) on the second floor.

In 1994, the respondent spouses Fortunato and Anastacia (Marie) Flores constructed their house/sari sari store on the vacant municipal/barrio road immediately adjoining the rear perimeter wall of Alolino's house. Since they were constructing on a municipal road, the respondents could not secure a building permit. The structure is only about two (2) to three (3) inches away from the back of Alolino's house, covering five windows and the exit door. The respondents' construction deprived Alolino of the light and ventilation he had previously enjoyed and prevented his ingress and egress to the municipal road through the rear door of his house.

Alolino demanded that the respondent spouses remove their structure but the latter refused. Thus, he complained about the illegal construction to the Building Official of the Municipality of Taguig. He also filed a complaint with the Barangay of Tuktukan.

Acting on Alolino's complaint, the Building Official issued a Notice of Illegal Construction against the respondents on February 15, 1995, directing them to immediately stop further construction.[4]

Sometime in 2001 or 2002, the respondents began constructing a second floor to their structure, again without securing a building permit. This floor was to serve as residence for their daughter, Maria Teresa Sison. The construction prompted Alolino to file another complaint with the Building Official of Taguig.

The building official issued a second Notice of Illegal Construction against the respondents on May 6, 2002,

directing the respondents to desist from their illegal construction.[5]

On May 17, 2002, the Office of the Barangay Council of Tuktukan issued a certification that no settlement was reached between the parties relative to Alolino's 1994 complaint.[6]

The respondents did not comply with the directive from the building official. This prompted Alolino to send them a letter dated January 23, 2003, demanding the removal of their illegally constructed structure.

Despite receipt of the demand letter, the respondents refused to comply. Thus, on February 14, 2003, Alolino filed a complaint against the respondents with the RTC praying for: (1) the removal of the encroaching structure; (2) the enforcement of his right to easement of light and view; and (3) the payment of damages. Alolino claimed that the respondents' encroaching structure deprived him of his light and view and obstructed the air ventilation inside his house. The complaint was docketed as Civil Case No. 69320.

In their answer,[7] the respondent spouses denied that Alolino had a cause of action against them. They alleged that they had occupied their lot where they constructed their house in 1955, long before the plaintiff purchased his lot in the 70s. They further alleged that plaintiff only has himself to blame because he constructed his house up to the very boundary of his lot without observing the required setback. Finally, they emphasized that the wall of their house facing Alolino's does not violate the latter's alleged easement of light and view because it has no window.

The respondents also admitted to them that they did not secure a building permit because the property was constructed on a municipal/barrio road. They claimed, however, that on March 1, 2004, the Sangguniang Bayan of Taguig (the Sanggunian) reclassified the property as a residential lot from its prior classification as a barrio/municipal road.[8]

During the trial, both parties moved for an ocular inspection of the premises. Consequently, on November 19, 2007, the RTC ordered the branch clerk of court, the deputy sheriff, and the stenographer to conduct the inspection. The ocular inspection was conducted on December 6, 2007.

In their report dated January 30, 2008,[9] the inspection team confirmed that the respondents' property blocked the entry of light and air to Alolino's house.

On April 20, 2009, the RTC rendered a judgment ordering the respondents to remove their illegal structure obstructing Alolino's right to light and view.

The RTC found that Alolino had already previously acquired an easement of light and view and that the respondents subsequently blocked this easement with their construction. It held that the respondents' illegal construction was a private nuisance with respect to Alolino because it prevented him from using the back portion of his property and obstructed his free passage to the barrio/municipal road. The court farther held that the respondents' house was a public nuisance, having been illegally constructed on a barrio road - a government property - without a building permit.

The respondents appealed the decision to the CA and was docketed as CA-G.R. CV No. 94524.

On July 8, 2011, the CA reversed the RTC decision and dismissed the complaint for lack of merit.

The CA held (1) that Alolino had not acquired an easement of light and view because he never gave a formal prohibition against the respondents pursuant to Article 668[10] of the Civil Code; (2) that Alolino was also at fault, having built his house up to the edge of the property line in violation of the National Building Code;[11] (3) that Alolino had not acquired an easement of right of way to the barrio Road; and (4) that the respondents' house was not a public nuisance because it did not endanger the safety of its immediate surroundings.

The CA concluded that the Government had already abandoned the barrio road pursuant to the 2004 Sanggunian resolution. It further held that the respondents' property could not be demolished, citing Section 28 of the Urban Development and Housing Act.[12]

Alolino moved for reconsideration on July 28, 2011.

On September 28, 2011, the CA denied the motion for reconsideration and maintained that Alolino had not acquired an easement of light and view.

Thus, on November 15, 2011, Alolino filed the present petition for review on certiorari.

The Petition

Alolino insists (1) that he acquired an easement of light and view by virtue of a title because the respondents constructed their house on a barrio road; (2) that the provision of Sec. 708 of the National Building Code and Article 670 of the Civil Code prescribing the setbacks is inapplicable because the property is adjacent to a barrio road; (3) that he has a right of way over the lot occupied by the respondents because it is a barrio road; and (4) that the respondents' house/sari sari store is a nuisance per se.

In its comment, the respondent counters (1) that Alolino has not acquired an easement of light and view or an easement of right of way, by either prescription or title; (2) that Alolino is at fault for constructing his house up to the edge of his property line without observing the setbacks required in Article 670 of the Civil Code and Section 702 of the National Building Code; and (3) that their house/sari sari store is not a nuisance because it is not a serious threat to public safety and the Sanggunian has already reclassified the lot as residential.

Our Ruling

We find the petition meritorious.

There is no dispute that respondents built their house/sari sari store on government property. Properties of Local Government Units (LGUs) are classified as either property for public use or patrimonial property.[13] Article 424 of the Civil Code distinguishes between the two classifications:

Article 424. Property for public use, in the provinces, cities, and municipalities, consist of the provincial roads, city streets, municipal streets, the squares, fountains, public waters, promenades, and public works for public service paid for by said provinces, cities, or municipalities.

All other property possessed by any of them is patrimonial and shall be governed by this Code, without prejudice to the provisions of special laws.[14] (emphasis supplied)

From the foregoing, the barrio road adjacent to Alolino's house is property of public dominion devoted to public use.

We find no merit in the respondents' contention that the Local Government of Taguig had already withdrawn the subject barrio road from public use and reclassified it as a residential lot. The Local Government Code[15] (LGC) authorizes an LGU to withdraw a local road from public use under the folio wing conditions:

Section 21. Closure and Opening of Roads. -

(a)

A local government unit may, pursuant to an ordinance, permanently or temporarily close or open any local road, alley, park, or square falling within its jurisdiction; Provided, however, That in case of permanent closure, such ordinance must be approved by at least two-thirds (2/3) of all the members of the Sanggunian,

and when necessary, an adequate substitute for the public facility that is subject to closure is provided.

(b)

No such way or place or any part thereof shall be permanently closed without making provisions for the maintenance of public safety therein. A property thus permanently withdrawn from public use may be used or conveyed for any purpose for which other real property belonging to the local government unit concerned may be lawfully used or conveyed. x x x

To convert a barrio road into patrimonial property, the law requires the LGU to enact an ordinance, approved by at least two-thirds (2/3) of the Sanggunian members, permanently closing the road.

In this case, the Sanggunian did not enact an ordinance but merely passed a resolution. The difference between an ordinance and a resolution is settled in jurisprudence: an ordinance is a law but a resolution is only a declaration of sentiment or opinion of the legislative body.[16]

Properties of the local government that are devoted to public service are deemed public and are under the absolute control of Congress.[17] Hence, LGUs cannot control or regulate the use of these properties unless specifically authorized by Congress, as is the case with Section 21 of the LGC.[18] In exercising this authority, the LGU must comply with the conditions and observe the limitations prescribed by Congress. The Sanggunian's failure to comply with Section 21 renders ineffective its reclassification of the barrio road.

As a barrio road, the subject lot's purpose is to serve the benefit of the collective citizenry. It is outside the commerce of man and as a consequence: (1) it is not alienable or disposable;[19] (2) it is not subject to registration under Presidential Decree No. 1529 and cannot be the subject of a Torrens title;[20] (3) it is not susceptible to prescription;[21] (4) it cannot be leased, sold, or otherwise be the object of a contract;[22] (5) it is not subject to attachment and execution;[23] and (6) it cannot be burdened by any voluntary easements.[24]

An easement is an encumbrance imposed upon an immovable for the benefit of another immovable belonging to a different owner or for the benefit of a community, or of one or more persons to whom the encumbered estate does not belong.[25] Continuous and apparent easements may be acquired by virtue of a title or by prescription of ten years.[26] Meanwhile, continuous but non-apparent easements and discontinuous ones can only be acquired by virtue of a title.[27] Used in this sense, title refers to a juridical justification for the acquisition of a right. It may refer to a law, a will, a donation, or a contract.

We must distinguish between the respondents' house and the land it is built on. The land itself is public property devoted to public use. It is not susceptible to prescription and cannot be burdened with voluntary easements. On the other hand, the respondents' house is private property, albeit illegally constructed on public property. It can be the object of prescription and can be burdened with voluntary easements. Nevertheless, it is indisputable that the respondents have not voluntarily burdened their property with an easement in favor of Alolino.

An easement of a right of way is discontinuous and cannot be acquired through prescription.[28] On the other hand, an easement of light and view can be acquired through prescription counting from the time when the owner of the dominant estate formally prohibits the adjoining lot owner from blocking the view of a window located within the dominant estate.[29]

Notably, Alolino had not made (and could not have made) a formal prohibition upon the respondents prior to their construction in 1994; Alolino could not have acquired an easement of light and view through prescription. Thus, only easements created by law can burden the respondents' property.

The provisions on legal easements are found in Book II, Title VII, Chapter 2 of the Civil Code whose specific

coverage we list and recite below for clarity and convenience.

Section 3 (Articles 649-657) governs legal easements of right of way. Article 649 creates a legal easement in favor of an owner or any person entitled to use any immovable, which is landlocked by other immovables pertaining to other persons without an adequate access to a public highway. Article 652 creates a legal easement in favor of an isolated piece of land acquired by sale, exchange, partition, or donation when it is surrounded by other estates of the vendor, exchanger, co-owner, or donor. Article 653 grants the same right of way. in favor of the vendor, exchanger, co-owner, or donor when his property is the one that becomes isolated. Article 656 grants the owner of an estate, after payment of indemnity, a right of way to carry materials through the estate of another when it is indispensable for the construction or repair of a building in his estate. Finally, Article 657 governs right of way easements for the passage of livestock.

None of these provisions are applicable to Alolino's property with respect to the barrio road where the respondents' house stands on.

On the other hand, Section 5 of Book II, Title VII, Chapter 2 of the Civil Code (Articles 667-673) governs legal easements of light and view. These seven provisions are:

SECTION 5

Easement of Light and View

Article 667. No part-owner may, without the consent of the others, open through the party wall any window or aperture of any kind.

Article 668. The period of prescription for the acquisition of an easement of light and view shall be counted: (1) From the time of the opening of the window, if it is through a party wall; or (2) From the time of the formal prohibition upon the proprietor of the adjoining land or tenement, if the window is through a wall on the dominant estate.

Article 669. When the distances in article 670 are not observed, the owner of a wall which is not party wall, adjoining a tenement or piece of land belonging to another, can make in it openings to admit light at the height of the ceiling joints or immediately under the ceiling, and of the size of thirty centimeters square, and, in every case, with an iron grating imbedded in the wall and with a wire screen.

Nevertheless, the owner of the tenement or property adjoining the wall in which the openings are made can close them should he acquire part-ownership thereof, if there be no stipulation to the contrary.

He can also obstruct them by constructing a building on his land or by raising a wall thereon contiguous to that having such openings, unless an easement of light has been acquired.

Article 670. No windows, apertures, balconies, or other similar projections which afford a direct view upon or towards an adjoining land or tenement can be made, without leaving a distance of two meters between the wall in which they are made and such contiguous property.

Neither can side or oblique views upon or towards such conterminous property be had, unless there be a distance of sixty centimeters.

The nonobservance of these distances does not give rise to prescription.

Article 671. The distance referred to in the preceding article shall be measured in cases of direct views from the outer line of the wall when the openings do not project, from the outer line of the latter when they do, and, in cases of oblique view, from the dividing line between the two properties.

Article 672. The provisions of article 670 are not applicable to buildings separated by a public way or alley,

which is not less than three meters wide, subject to special regulations and local ordinances.

Article 673. Whenever by any title a right has been acquired to have direct views, balconies or belvederes overlooking an adjoining property, the owner of the servient estate cannot build thereon at less than a distance of three meters to be measured in the manner provided in article 671. Any stipulation permitting distances less than those prescribed in article 670 is void.

However, none of these provisions actually create a legal easement of light and view which can only be acquired through prescription or a by virtue of a voluntary title.

From the foregoing, we agree with the respondents that Alolino does not have an easement of light and view or an easement of right of way over the respondents' property or the barrio road it stands on. This does not mean, however, that the respondents are entitled to continue occupying the barrio road and blocking the rear of Alolino's house. Every building is subject to the easement which prohibits the proprietor or possessor from committing nuisance.[30] Under Article 694 of the Civil Code, the respondents' house is evidently a nuisance:

Art. 694. A nuisance is any act, omission, establishment, business, condition of property, or anything else which:

- (1) Injures or endangers the health or safety of others; or
- (2) Annoys or offends the senses; or
- (3) Shocks, defies or disregards decency or morality; or
- (4) Obstructs or interferes with the free passage of any public highway or street, or any body of water; or
- (5) Hinders or impairs the use of property, (emphasis supplied)

A barrio road is designated for the use of the general public who are entitled to free and unobstructed passage thereon. Permanent obstructions on these roads, such as the respondents' illegally constructed house, are injurious to public welfare and convenience. The occupation and use of private individuals of public places devoted to public use constitute public and private nuisances and nuisance per se.[31]

The CA clearly erred when it invoked Section 28 of the Urban Development and Housing Act as a ground to deny the demolition of respondents' illegal structure. The invoked provision reads:

Sec. 28. Eviction and Demolition. - Eviction or demolition as a practice shall be discouraged. Eviction or demolition, however, may be allowed under the following situations:

(a)

When persons or entities occupy danger -areas such as esteros, railroad tracks, garbage dumps, riverbanks, shorelines, waterways, and other public places such as sidewalks, roads, parks, and playgrounds;

x x x x

(c)

When there is a court order for eviction and demolition. x x x (emphasis supplied)

The invoked provision itself allows the demolition of illegal structures on public roads and sidewalks because these nuisances are injurious to public welfare. Evidently, the respondents have no right to maintain their occupation and permanent obstruction of the barrio road. The interests of the few do not outweigh the greater interest of public health, public safety, good order, and general welfare.

WHEREFORE, the petition is GRANTED. The decision of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CV No. 94524 is REVERSED and SET ASIDE and the decision of the Regional Trial Court, Pasig City, Branch 153 in Civil Case No. 69320 is REINSTATED.

The respondents, and all persons claiming rights under them, are ORDERED to remove and demolish their illegal structure. The respondents are also ORDERED to pay the petitioner the sum of One Hundred Thousand Pesos (P100,000.00) as attorney's fees. Costs against the respondents.

SO ORDERED.

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

[1] Rollo, pp. 277-286. Penned by Associate Justice Manuel M. Barrios and concurred in by Associate Justices Mario L. Guariña III and Japar B. Dimaampao.

[2] Id. at 225-232. RTC of Pasig City, Branch 153.

[3] Id. Penned by Judge Briccio C. Ygaña.

[4] Id. at 123.

[5] Id. at 124.

[6] Id. at 110, 122.

[7] Id. at 127-130.

[8] Pursuant to Sangguniang Bayan Resolution No. 15, Series of 2004; id. at 182.

[9] Id. at 96-106.

[10] Art. 668. The period of prescription for the acquisition of an easement of light and view shall be counted:

(1) From the time of the opening of the window, if it is through a party wall; or

(2) From the time of the formal prohibition upon the proprietor of the adjoining land or tenement, if the window is through a wall on the dominant estate.

[11] Section 708. Minimum Requirements for Group A Dwellings -

(a) Dwelling Location and Lot Occupancy.

The dwelling shall occupy not more than ninety percent of a corner lot and eighty percent of an inside lot, and subject to the provisions on Easement on Light and View of the Civil Code of the Philippines, shall be at least 2 meters from the property line.

[12] An Act to Provide for a Comprehensive and Continuing Urban Development and Housing Program. Establish the Mechanism for its Implementation, and for Other Purposes [URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING ACT], Republic Act No. 7279, Section 28 (1992).

[13] Art. 423, CIVIL CODE.

[14] Art. 424, CIVIL CODE.

[15] An Act Providing for a Local Government Code of 1991 [LOCAL GOVERNMENT CODE], Republic Act

No. 7160 (1991).

[16] Municipality of Parañaque v. V.M. Realty Corporation, 354 Phil. 684, 693 (1998).

[17] Macasiano v. Diokno, G.R. No. 97764, 10 August 1992, 212 SCRA 464, 469.

[18] Id.

[19] Roman Catholic Bishop of Kalibo v. Municipality of Buruanga, 520 Phil. 753, 799 (2006).

[20] Bishop of Calbayog v. Director of Lands, 150-A Phil. 806, 813 (1972).

[21] Arts. 1108, 1113 CIVIL CODE:

Art. 1113. All things which are within the commerce of men [man] are susceptible of [to] prescription, unless otherwise provided. Property of the State or any of its subdivisions not patrimonial in character shall not be the object of prescription. (emphasis supplied)

[22] Arts. 1347, 1409, CIVIL CODE.

[23] Id. see also Villarico v. Sarmiento-Del Mundo, 484 Phil. 724, 729 (2004) citing TOLENTINO II, Civil Code (1992 ed.), 31-32.

[24] Id. Villarico v. Sarmiento-Del Mundo, Supra note 23.

[25] Arts. 613, 614, CIVIL CODE.

[26] Art. 620, CIVIL CODE.

[27] Art. 622, CIVIL CODE.

[28] Art. 622, CIVIL CODE; Ronquillo v. Roco, 103 Phil. 84, S9 (1958); reiterated in Costabella Corporation v. Court of Appeals, 271 Phil. 350, 357 (1991).

[29] Art. 668, CIVIL CODE.

[30] Art. 682, Civil Code.

[31] Stitchon v. Aquino, 98 Phil. 458, 464-466 (1956); Dacanay v. Asistio, G.R. No. 93654, 6 May 1992, 208 SCRA 404, 408 citing PADILLA, Civil Code Annotated, Vol. II, p. 59, 6th Ed.

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.