

****Title:**** St. Louis Realty Corporation vs. Court of Appeals and Conrado J. Aramil

****Facts:****

This case involves a claim for damages due to a wrongful advertisement published by St. Louis Realty Corporation in the Sunday Times. The advertisement used a photograph of the residence of Doctor Conrado J. Aramil without his permission, falsely attributing the house to a Mr. Arcadio S. Arcadio. The advertisement appeared on December 15, 1968, and January 5, 1969, and described the Arcadio family as having moved from a cramped neighborhood to a new house in Brookside Hills, which was actually the residence of Doctor Aramil.

Upon noticing the mistake, Doctor Aramil, a neuropsychiatrist and faculty member at the U.E. Ramon Magsaysay Memorial Hospital, wrote a letter of protest to St. Louis Realty on January 5, 1969, expressing his concern that the unauthorized use of his house for promotional gain damaged his prestige in the medical profession and caused mental anguish. St. Louis Realty's advertising officer, Ernesto Magtoto, ceased further publication of the advertisement and met with Doctor Aramil to offer apologies but did not publish any rectification or apology.

On February 20, 1969, Doctor Aramil demanded actual, moral, and exemplary damages amounting to P110,000 from St. Louis Realty. The company claimed the error was an honest mistake and offered to rectify it in the Manila Times. Subsequently, an advertisement featuring the Arcadio family with their actual house was published on March 18, 1969, but no apology or explanation was included. Following this, on March 29, 1969, Doctor Aramil filed a complaint for damages. St. Louis Realty later published a "NOTICE OF RECTIFICATION" on April 15, 1969.

The trial court ruled in favor of Doctor Aramil, awarding him P8,000 in actual damages, P20,000 in moral damages, and P2,000 in attorney's fees. St. Louis Realty appealed the decision to the Court of Appeals, which affirmed the trial court's judgment. St. Louis Realty then appealed to the Supreme Court.

****Issues:****

1. Did the unauthorized use of Doctor Aramil's house and misrepresentation constitute an actionable quasi-delict under Articles 21 and 26 of the Civil Code?
2. Were the damages awarded by the trial court, and affirmed by the Court of Appeals, appropriate and sanctioned under relevant laws?

Court's Decision:

1. **Actionable Quasi-Delict Under Articles 21 and 26:**

- The Supreme Court upheld the findings of the lower courts that St. Louis Realty committed an actionable quasi-delict. Article 26 of the Civil Code mandates the respect of the dignity, personality, privacy, and peace of mind of individuals. The wrongful publication of Doctor Aramil's house, implying it belonged to another, and the subsequent failure to provide an appropriate apology or rectification, constituted prying into his privacy and disturbing his private life. Therefore, it violated his right to privacy.

2. **Assessment of Damages:**

- The Court found the damages awarded by the trial court to be in accordance with the law. Articles 2200, 2208, and 2219 of the Civil Code justify the recovery of actual, moral, and exemplary damages. Specifically, Article 2219 allows for moral damages in instances covered by Article 26, which includes the invasion of privacy. The Court agreed with the trial court and the Appellate Court that Doctor Aramil suffered mental anguish and a reduced income due to the wrongful advertisement. The Supreme Court affirmed the computation and the rationale behind the damages awarded.

Doctrine:

This case reiterates and establishes the application of:

- **Article 26 of the Civil Code:** It emphasizes that any acts that pries into the privacy of another's residence or disturbs their private life give rise to an actionable claim for damages.
- **Articles 2200, 2208, and 2219 of the Civil Code:** These articles sanction the awarding of actual, moral, and exemplary damages for harm suffered due to such wrongful acts.

Class Notes:

- **Quasi-delict:** Elements include an actionable injury, fault or negligence on part of defendant, causal connection between fault/negligence and injury.
- **Right to Privacy** under **Article 26 of the Civil Code:** Protects individual dignity, personality, privacy, and peace of mind from disturbance.
- **Damages** applicable under **Articles 2200, 2208, and 2219 of the Civil Code:**
- **Actual Damages:** Compensation for pecuniary loss.
- **Moral Damages:** For physical suffering, mental anguish, fright, serious anxiety, besmirched reputation, wounded feelings, moral shock, social humiliation, and similar injury.
- **Exemplary Damages:** By way of example or correction for the public good.

****Historical Background:****

This case took place in an era when the right to privacy started gaining significant recognition in Philippine jurisprudence. The decision highlights the judiciary's approach towards protecting individual rights against unauthorized commercial exploitation and the corresponding mental anguish such invasions can cause. This context also underscores a growing sensitivity to personal rights in response to rapidly advancing media and advertising practices during the late 1960s.