

## **SPECIAL EIGHTEENTH DIVISION**

**[ CA G.R. CEB CV NO. 03098, February 06, 2014 ]**

**PHILIPPINE NATIONAL BANK, PLAINTIFF-APPELLEE, VS. HEIRS  
OF HUMBERTO VILLEGAS AND GUILLERMA VILLEGAS,  
DEFENDANTS-APPELLANTS.**

### **D E C I S I O N**

**DIY, J.:**

Defendants-appellants appeal the May 29, 2009 Decision<sup>[1]</sup> of Branch 34, Regional Trial Court of Dumaguete City, which granted plaintiff-appellee Philippine National Bank's (PNB, for brevity) complaint for specific performance with damages.<sup>[2]</sup>

The appealed decision decreed:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, defendants are hereby directed to surrender Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955 in the name of Guillerma Villegas to plaintiff Philippine National Bank so that the mortgages of the lot thereon will be annotated on the said certificate of title. The extrajudicial foreclosure and the Sheriff's Certificate of Sale, however, could not yet be annotated on said certificate in view of the decision of the Court of Appeals in the related case docketed as Special Civil Action No. 13518, entitled Heirs of Humberto Villegas versus Philippine National Bank for Mandamus with Damages lodged in Branch 39 of this Court stating that Humberto Villegas, predecessor of defendants may still avail of restructuring his delinquent loan with the plaintiff pursuant to Republic Act No. 7202.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[3]</sup>

The factual antecedents as culled from the records are as follows:

Sometime in 1973, defendant-appellant Guillerma Villegas (Guillerma, for brevity)<sup>[4]</sup> authorized her husband Humberto to avail of the 1973-1974 crop loan from PNB. PNB loaned the amount of P17,600.00 to the Spouses Humberto and Guillerma Villegas (hereinafter, Spouses Villegas). As security for the loan, real estate mortgages were constituted over several parcels of land belonging to the spouses. Among the properties over which real estate mortgages were constituted was Cadastral Lot No. 2433 which is located at Guihulngan, Negros Oriental and comprises 311 square meters (hereinafter, Lot No. 2433). At the time the real estate mortgages were constituted, Lot No. 2433 was then covered by Tax Declaration No. 99-08-001-03558. Hence, the encumbrance thereon was not registered. The real estate mortgage deed, however, provided that should a certificate of title be issued over the lot, the mortgagors undertake to deliver the certificate of title to PNB for the annotation of the liens thereon.<sup>[5]</sup> As can be gleaned from the records, these

real estate mortgages were extended and renewed.

In 1976, the Spouses Villegas were able to have Lot No. 2433 registered in the name of Guillerma. Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955 was thereafter issued to her on January 7, 1976.<sup>[6]</sup>

The Spouses Villegas later defaulted in the payment of the loan and PNB subsequently initiated extrajudicial foreclosure proceedings. The auction sale of the foreclosed property was conducted on September 3, 1986 with PNB as the highest bidder. The Spouses Villegas further failed to redeem the property within the redemption period and PNB thereafter conducted inspection and appraisal of the lot in preparation for consolidation of ownership over the same. In the course of its audit and inspection, PNB discovered the fact of issuance of Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955. As the real estate mortgage was not annotated on the lot's certificate of title, PNB could not consolidate its title over the property. PNB attempted to obtain Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955 from the Spouses Villegas but the latter allegedly refused to surrender the same.

On May 10, 2006, PNB filed a complaint for specific performance with damages impleading the heirs of the Spouses Villegas as defendants. The complaint sought to compel the heirs of the Spouses Villegas to surrender Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955 to PNB. PNB likewise claimed moral and exemplary damages as well as attorney's fees.

On June 26, 2006, defendants-appellants filed their Answer<sup>[7]</sup> alleging therein that the several parcels of land mortgaged with PNB, including Lot No. 2433, are subject of a petition for mandamus docketed as Case No. 13518 before Branch 39, Regional Trial Court, Dumaguete City.<sup>[8]</sup> Defendants-appellants in their petition for mandamus claimed that they sought the restructuring of their loan pursuant to Republic Act No. 7202 also known as Sugar Restitution Law. The petition for mandamus was dismissed per October 6, 2006 Resolution<sup>[9]</sup> of Branch 39, Regional Trial Court of Dumaguete City but said Resolution was reversed and set aside per the June 7, 2007 Decision of the Nineteenth Division of this Court in CA-G.R. SP No. 02447.<sup>[10]</sup> This Court then held that defendants-appellants are entitled to the benefits under Republic Act No. 7202. As special and affirmative defenses, defendants-appellants challenged the authority of a certain Mr. Cupido Cadimas to file the complaint in PNB's behalf. They likewise questioned why they were impleaded as "Heirs of Humberto Villegas" contending that such is not a natural or juridical person authorized to sue or be sued under the Rules of Court. Defendants-appellants further claimed that at the time the mortgage was constituted, Lot No. 2433 had not been declared alienable and disposable and consequently cannot be transferred in PNB's name. Defendants-appellants likewise raised prescription alleging that the cause of action for specific performance had prescribed and laches had also set in.

On May 29, 2009, the court a quo rendered the appealed decision ruling in favor of PNB. It held that defendants-appellants are legally obligated to surrender the certificate of title in order that the real estate mortgage constituted over the property could be annotated thereon. The court a quo, however, stressed that considering the ruling in CA-G.R. SP No. 02447, the extrajudicial foreclosure of the property as well as the certificate of sale of the property cannot as yet be annotated

on the certificate of title. The court *a quo* further denied PNB's prayer for damages.

Defendants-appellants are thus now before Us raising the following as –

#### ASSIGNMENT OF ERRORS

The defendants-appellants respectfully submit the following errors committed by the court *a quo*:

1. The court *a quo* with all due respect, erred in disregarding the principle of PRESCRIPTION to apply in the instant case;
2. The court *a quo* with all due respect, erred in failing to consider the equitable principle of laches. [sic]
3. The court *a quo*, with all due respect, failed to apply the principle of estoppel upon the plaintiff-appellee;
4. The court *a quo*, with all due respect, failed to consider that the instant case is being filed as a circumvention of the principle that Title under the Torrens System cannot be collaterally attacked.
5. The court *a quo* failed to consider that the decision in Special Civil Case No. CA-G.R. SP No. 02447 for petition for Mandamus entitled Hrs. of Humberto Villegas vs. PNB, et al. which has now become final and executory has rendered the instant case moot and academic.<sup>[11]</sup>

To summarize, the court *a quo* granted PNB's prayer for defendants-appellants to surrender Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955 for the purpose of annotating the encumbrance thereon. The court *a quo*, however, emphasized that the extrajudicial foreclosure of the property as well as its auction sale cannot as yet be annotated on Transfer Certificate of Title No. FV-19955 in view of this Court's decision in CA-G.R. SP No. 02447. Defendants-appellants would, however, have Us reverse the appealed decision primarily contending that laches, prescription, and estoppel have set in thus, barring PNB's cause of action.

A real mortgage is a contract in which the debtor guarantees to the creditor the fulfillment of a principal obligation, subjecting for the faithful compliance therewith a real property in case of non-fulfillment of said obligation at the time stipulated.<sup>[12]</sup>

Article 2085 of the Civil Code enumerates the requisites for the validity of a pledge or mortgage as follows:

1. That they be constituted to secure the fulfillment of a principal obligation;
2. That the pledgor or mortgagor be the absolute owner of the thing pledged or mortgaged;
3. That the persons constituting the pledge or mortgage have the free disposal of their property, and in the absence thereof, that they be legally authorized for the purpose.