

TWENTY-THIRD DIVISION

[CA-G.R. CV NO. 02542-MIN, February 06, 2015]

**WILREDO PALMA^[*] AND TERESITA PALMA, PLAINTIFF-
APPELLANTS, VS. FRANCISO P. LIM AND MARIBEL PARDO-LIM.
DEFENDANT-APPELLEES.**

D E C I S I O N

CONTRERAS, J.:

On appeal is the Decision^[1] dated May 9, 2011 of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 12, Zamboanga City, in Civil Case No. 4922 for Grant of Easement with Damages.

Plaintiffs, now appellants, Wilfredo Palma and Teresita Palma, filed on May 18, 1999, a Complaint^[2] for Grant of Easement with Damages against defendants, now appellees, before RTC, Branch 12, Zamboanga City alleging that they are the registered owners of a parcel of land located at Dona Benita Drive, Canelar, Zamboanga City covered by Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. T-73,814,^[3] and more particularly described as follows:

"A parcel of land (Lot 1 of the consolidation subdivision plan, Pcs-09-[000518], being a portion of Lots 1 & 3, Pcs-09-000328, LRC Cad. Rec. No. 7880), situated in the Barrio of Canelar, City of Zamboanga, Island of Mindanao. Bounded on the West line 2-3; on the North line 3-4 by Lot 3; line 4-5; on the East line 5-6 by Lot 2, both of the consolidation subd. Plan; on the South line line 6-1-2 by Lot 622-C-6-A Psd-09-004303 existing right of way xxx containing an area of ONE THOUSAND FIFTY TWO (1,052) SQUARE METERS ... xxx"

Appellants alleged that from their property (the dominant estate), the nearest possible and convenient outlet to the public highway is through a cemented road right-of-way (or the subdivision alley known as Lot No. 622-C-7, Psd-1113525) donated by Mrs. Benita Julian to the City Government. To reach the said road right-of-way, however, they first have to pass through the only front exterior lot which is a two-meter-wide strip of land (the servient estate) covered by TCT No. T-62,474^[4] in the name of the appellees, Francisco Lim and Maribel Pardo-Lim, containing an area of Two Hundred Seventy Four (274) square meters, and is situated between their property and the road right-of-way. The servient estate which runs lengthwise and parallel to the existing road right-of-way up to the boundary of appellant's another property was previously sold to the appellees by the Julian Family, the previous owners of most of the lots situated in that area including that of the dominant estate.

It was appellants' belief that the servient estate will be added up to the existing road right-of-way such that when the latter was cemented, one-half portion of the

servient estate, which the public and residents of the area used as part of the right-of-way was also cemented by the City Government. On August 16, 1994, the Sangguniang Panlungsod of Zamboanga City also issued Resolution No. 1087^[5] resolving to acquire the servient estate.

However, in November 1998, appellees constructed a fence wall through the length of the servient estate effectively depriving the appellants of any ingress and egress from the dominant estate. Their objections to the construction of the wall and offers to pay and of possible compromise relative to the grant of an easement of a right-of-way through the servient estate were to no avail.

In Answer,^[6] appellees deny appellants' claim that the servient estate is a right-of-way. They, instead, asserted that the construction of a fence was a mere exercise of their ownership over the servient estate and that it was meant to safeguard their persons and their properties from criminal elements. If the fence had sealed off appellants' outlet to the subdivision alley, they cannot be compelled to grant a right-of-way to the former because the isolation of the dominant estate was due to the fault of its former owner.

Appellees claim that in 1980, appellee Francisco Lim asked permission from Benita Ledesma, the registered owner of a subdivision alley identified as Lot No. 622-C-7, Psd-1113525 (or the existing cemented road right-of-way), to allow him to fence off the northwest side of said alley to prevent criminal elements from roaming and hiding in the vacant lot adjacent to the alley and in front of his residence. However, Ledesma refused and instead offered to sell to Francisco a 2-meter-wide strip of land which runs parallel to the alley for his proposed fence, excluding only a portion measuring 3 meters wide to be used as Ledesma's exit from her own lot. Accepting the offer, Francisco Lim purchased an area containing 274 square meters that was segregated from Lot No. 622-C-6 pursuant to approved subdivision plan Psd-09-004303. Consequently, a Deed of Absolute Sale was executed in his favor by Ledesma on December 5, 1980, and TCT No. T-62,474 for Lot No. 622-C-6-A containing an area of 274 square meters was, thereafter, issued in the name of Francisco.

Subsequently, Ledesma caused the consolidation of Lot No. 621-H (L.R.C.), Psd-163294 and Lot No. 622-C-6-B, Psd-09-004303 and then subdivided the same into 3 lots under the consolidation-subdivision plan Pcs-09-000328 approved on January 23, 1981. Then, Ledesma consolidated again Lot 1 and 3 of Pcs-09-000328 and subdivided them again into 3 lots. The consolidation-subdivision was approved on February 20, 1984, under Pcs-09-000518. With said subdivision, appellees claim that Lot 1, Psd-09-000518, now registered under appellants' name, was isolated but such isolation was due to the approval of Pcs-09-000518 on the behest of Ledesma, the previous owner. When the appellants purchased the property, they already knew of its location and that it was bounded and blocked from the Sta. Maria road and the subdivision alley by the other lots owned by Ledesma. Since its isolation was due to the acts of its previous owner, appellees claim that appellants cannot now legally compel them to grant the former a right-of-way.

On May 9, 2011, after trial, the RTC rendered a Decision dismissing the case, the dispositive portion of which states:

WHEREFORE, in light of all the foregoing and finding the plaintiffs' prayer for the establishment or granting of an easement of right of way over the defendants' property unmeritorious and without legal and factual basis, the same is hereby DENIED and the above-entitled case is hereby ordered DISMISSED. No pronouncement as to cost.

Hence, the present appeal with the appellants ascribing to the lower court the lone error in that the Court *a quo* erred in dismissing their case.

The Court's Ruling.

The appeal is bereft of merit.

An easement is a real right on another's property, corporeal and immovable, whereby the owner of the latter must refrain from doing or allowing somebody else to do or something to be done on his property, for the benefit of another person or tenement. Easements are established either by law or by the will of the owner. The former are called legal, and the latter, voluntary easements.^[7]

The grant of a legal easement of right-of-way is governed by Articles 649 and 650 of the Civil Code which provides:

Article 649. The owner, or any person who by virtue of a real right may cultivate or use any immovable, which is surrounded by other immovables pertaining to other persons and without adequate outlet to a public highway, is entitled to demand a right of way through the neighboring estates, after payment of the proper indemnity.

Should this easement be established in such a manner that its use may be continuous for all the needs of the dominant estate, establishing a permanent passage, the indemnity shall consist of the value of the land occupied and the amount of the damage caused to the servient estate.

In case the right of way is limited to the necessary passage for the cultivation of the estate surrounded by others and for the gathering of its crops through the servient estate without a permanent way, the indemnity shall consist in the payment of the damages caused by such encumbrance.

This easement is not compulsory if the isolation of the immovable is due to the proprietor's own acts.

Article 650. The easement of right of way shall be established at the point least prejudicial to the servient estate, and, insofar as consistent with this rule, where the distance from the dominant estate to a public highway may be the shortest.

To be entitled to an easement of right-of-way, the following requisites should be met:

1. The dominant estate is surrounded by other immovables and has no adequate outlet to a public highway;