

#### Title:

Quiros and Villegas vs. Arjona et al., G.R. No. 135289, November 11, 2009

#### Facts:

1. **Initial Claim**:

- On December 19, 1996, Proceso Quiros and Leonarda Villegas filed a complaint with the Barangay Captain of Labney, San Jacinto, Pangasinan, for the recovery of ownership and possession of a parcel of land from their uncle, Marcelo Arjona.

2. **Amicable Settlement**:

- On January 5, 1997, an amicable settlement was reached, and Arjona executed an agreement (“Paknaan”) to give the petitioners 1 hectare of land inherited from their late grandmother, Rosa Arjona Quiros. Another Paknaan was executed by Jose Banda, indicating his consent to vacate the land he was tilling for the petitioners.

3. **MCTC Decision**:

- The petitioners filed with the Municipal Circuit Trial Court (MCTC) for the execution of the amicable settlement, which was denied due to the inability to determine the precise property in question.

4. **RTC Reversal**:

- On appeal, the Regional Trial Court (RTC) reversed the MCTC’s decision and ordered the issuance of a writ of execution.

5. **CA Appeal**:

- Respondents appealed to the Court of Appeals (CA), which reversed the RTC’s decision and reinstated the MCTC’s ruling, stating the contract was void due to insufficient description of the property.

- **Petition to SC**:

The petitioners elevated the case to the Supreme Court, challenging the CA’s ruling on the grounds that the Paknaan was a final and executory judgment under the law and could not be altered. They argued further that no formal repudiation had been filed within the 10-day period prescribed under Section 416 of the Local Government Code.

#### Issues:

1. **Finality and Enforceability of the Amicable Settlement**:

- Whether the Paknaan agreement, being unrepudiated within the 10-day period, should be executed as a final judgment.

2. **Certainty of the Object in the Paknaan**:

- Whether the lack of a precise description of the land in the Paknaan invalidates the contract or merely necessitates its reformation.

#### Court's Decision:

1. **Finality of Amicable Settlements (Issue 1)**:

- The Supreme Court acknowledged that an amicable settlement attains finality if unrepudiated within 10 days, becoming executable as a final judgment. However, it also pointed out that exceptions exist for specific and exceptional circumstances that may warrant suspension of its execution.

2. **Certainty of the Object (Issue 2)**:

- The Supreme Court agreed with the CA in denying the writ of execution due to the vagueness in the property's description, but disagreed on the contract's eligibility for nullification. Instead, it asserted the contract was subject to reformation, not nullification.

- The court cited Articles 1318 and 1349 of the Civil Code, confirming the validity of a contract as long as the object is determinable in kind.

- Article 1359, Civil Code, provides an avenue for reformation if an instrument does not reflect the parties' true intent due to mistake, fraud, inequitable conduct, or accident.

#### Doctrine:

1. **Reformation over Nullification**:

- Under the Civil Code, a contract lacking a precise description of the property subject can be reformed to reflect true intentions instead of being nullified.

- Article 1359 provides that reformation ensures enforcing the actual understanding between parties and adheres to principles of equity, preventing unjust enrichment.

#### Class Notes:

- **Contract Validity**:

- Three requisites per Article 1318, Civil Code:

1. Consent

2. Certain Object

### 3. Cause

- **Object Determination**:

- Article 1349, Civil Code: Objects must be determinable as to their kind without needing a new agreement.

- **Reformation**:

- Crucial provision under Article 1359, Civil Code for correcting a written instrument to match the parties' true intention.

- Reformation is applicable when there's a genuine agreement but an inaccurate instrument.

- **Final Judgment**:

- Section 416, Local Government Code: Amicable settlements become final if unrepudiated within 10 days.

#### #### Historical Background:

The case operates in the context of the Philippines' enforcement of amicable settlements under the Local Government Code, highlighting efforts to resolve disputes at the community level and reduce litigation congestion. The laws encouraging settlements without judicial intervention have roots in the nation's cultural emphasis on community resolution and family harmony.