

**## Title:**

Heirs of Margarita Prodon v. Heirs of Maximo S. Alvarez and Valentina Clave

**## Facts:**

1. **Initial Ownership and Transaction Dispute (Pre-1975)**: The property in question was originally owned by the late spouses Maximo S. Alvarez, Sr. and Valentina Clave, registered under Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. 84797. The heirs of Alvarez and Clave alleged Prodon fraudulently annotated a deed of sale with right to repurchase, claiming it didn't exist.
2. **Alleged Sale with Right to Repurchase (1975)**: Prodon claimed a deed executed on September 9, 1975, by Alvarez, Sr., granted Prodon the right to own the property after six months due to non-repurchase but the deed was not located during litigation.
3. **Trial Court Proceedings (1996-1997)**: The heirs of Alvarez and Clave filed an action for quieting of title and damages in the RTC against Prodon and the Register of Deeds of Manila. They alleged the entry was fictitious and harmed their title.
4. **RTC Judgment (1997)**: The RTC ruled in favor of Prodon, concluding based on secondary evidence that the deed was executed and the original possibly misplaced.
5. **Appeal to Court of Appeals (1997-2005)**: The heirs of Alvarez and Clave appealed, arguing the RTC erred in evidentiary admission and reasoning. The CA reversed the RTC's decision, citing insufficient proof of the deed's existence and the prerequisites for secondary evidence were not met.
6. **Supreme Court Review (2005-2013)**: Subsequent to a denied motion for reconsideration in the CA, the heirs of Prodon elevated the case to the Supreme Court.

**## Issues:**

1. Whether the prerequisites for the admission of secondary evidence about the deed were met.
2. Whether Maximo Alvarez, Sr. was physically capable of executing the deed.
3. Whether Prodon's claim of ownership was barred by laches.

**## Court's Decision:**

1. **Best Evidence Rule**: The Supreme Court held the Best Evidence Rule was not applicable as the issue was the deed's existence, not its content. The CA's assessment on

proof of existence, execution, and loss for secondary evidence was unnecessary, divergence from issue occurred due to RTC handling.

2. **Secondary Evidence and Execution (Existence)**: Prodon did not preponderantly establish the actual existence and execution of the deed. Inconsistencies about the physical and mental capacity of Alvarez, Sr. during the alleged signing period were noted. His poor health and frequent hospitalizations rendered it improbable for him to have conducted the alleged transactions.

3. **Evidence Admissibility**: The CA concluded secondary evidence couldn't be admitted due to inadequate proof of the original deed's loss/unavailability. The circumstances suggested improbability of the deed, which the RTC erroneously supported simply through testimonies.

4. **Possession and Ancillary Actions**: Prodon's lack of property possession, failure to transfer the title in her name, or paying of taxes indicated non-assertion of claimed rights—imbuing legitimacy to the respondents' possession claims.

#### **## Doctrine:**

- The Best Evidence Rule pertains only when direct content of a document is litigated, not where issues rest on its very existence.
- In actions for quieting of title, addressing whether a deed/document exists substantively trumps procedural evidentiary concerns with potential documents lacking secure foundational evidence.

#### **## Class Notes:**

- **Quieting of Title**: Requires legal interest in property and the existence of a cloud (apparent invalidity) on the title.
- **Best Evidence Rule**: Only engaged where content is in question—not when the existence of a document is the issue (Rules of Court, Rule 130, Sec. 3).
- **Secondary Evidence Admissibility**: Demands proof of original's loss/unavailability (Rules of Court, Rule 130, Sec. 5).

#### **## Historical Background:**

The case arose amidst complexities of property transactions in the Philippines where documentation errors, fraud claims, and procedural errors influenced ownership disputes. The ruling reflected systemic desires to resolve land ownership uncertainties and mitigate fraudulent transaction annotations widespread in property dealings.