

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 187677, April 17, 2013]

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES, REPRESENTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS (DPWH), PETITIONER, VS. HON. ROSA SAMSON-TATAD, AS PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE REGIONAL TRIAL COURT, BRANCH 105, QUEZON CITY, AND SPOUSES WILLIAM AND REBECCA GENATO, RESPONDENTS.

DECISION

SERENO, C.J.:

This is an appeal via a Petition for Review on Certiorari^[1] dated 19 June 2009 assailing the Decision^[2] and Resolution^[3] of the Court of Appeals (CA) in C.A. G.R. SP No. 93227 which affirmed the Orders^[4] of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 105, Quezon City in Civil Case No. Q-01-44595. The RTC barred petitioner from presenting evidence to prove its claim of ownership over the subject property, as the presentation thereof would constitute a collateral attack on private respondents' title.

The antecedent facts are as follows:

On 13 July 2001, petitioner Republic of the Philippines, represented by the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH), filed a Complaint against several defendants, including private respondents, for the expropriation of several parcels of land affected by the construction of the EDSA-Quezon Avenue Flyover.^[5] Private respondents, Spouses William and Rebecca Genato, are the registered owners of a piece of land ("subject property") covered by Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. RT-11603 (383648)^[6] and having an area of 460 square meters.

During the pendency of the proceedings, petitioner received a letter dated 14 June 2002 from Engr. Patrick B. Gatan, Project Manager IV of the DPWH-NCR, reporting that the subject property was "government land and that the transfer certificate of title of the said claimant [respondent] x x x is of dubious origin and of fabrication as it encroached or overlapped on a government property."^[7] As a result, petitioner filed an Amended Complaint on 24 June 2002,^[8] seeking to limit the coverage of the proceedings to an area conforming to the findings of the DPWH:

4. To accomplish said project, which is to be undertaken by the Department of Public Works and Highways [DPWH], it is necessary and urgent for plaintiff to acquire in fee simple portions of the following parcels of land belonging to, occupied, possessed, and/or the ownership of which are being claimed by the defendants, to wit:

x x x x

[c] Defendants William O. Genato and Rebecca G. Genato. –

x x x x

5. The portion of the above properties that are affected by the project and shaded green in the sketch plan hereto attached and made integral part hereof as Annex E, consisting of an area of: x x x [c] 460 square meters of the aforescribed property registered in the name of defendants spouses William and Rebecca Genato; x x x. (Emphasis in the original)

On 18 July 2002, petitioner filed a Manifestation and Motion^[9] to have the subject property “declared or considered of uncertain ownership or subject to conflicting claims.”

In an Order dated 10 December 2002,^[10] the RTC admitted petitioner’s Amended Complaint, deferred the release to respondents the amount of eighteen million four hundred thousand pesos (P18,400,000) deposited in the bank, equivalent to the current zonal valuation of the land, and declared the property as the subject of conflicting claims.

While petitioner was presenting evidence to show that the subject property actually belonged to the Government, private respondents interposed objections saying that petitioner was barred from presenting the evidence, as it constituted a collateral attack on the validity of their TCT No. RT-11603 (383648). The RTC then required the parties to submit their respective Memoranda.

Upon receipt of the Memoranda, the trial court issued on 12 July 2005 an Order^[11] as follows:

WHEFEFORE, premises considered, the Court finds that the issue of the validity of the TCT No. 11603 (383648) can only be raised in an action expressly instituted for that purpose and not in this instant proceeding. Accordingly, plaintiff is barred from presenting evidence as they [sic] constitute collateral attack on the validity of the title to the subject lot in violation of Sec. 48 of P. D. 1529.

On 4 August 2005, petitioner seasonably filed a Motion for Reconsideration,^[12] but the motion was denied by the RTC in an Order dated 17 November 2005.^[13]

On 4 January 2006, private respondents filed a Motion for the payment of just compensation amounting to twenty million seven hundred thousand pesos (P20,700,000) and for the release of eighteen million four hundred thousand pesos (P18,400,000) deposited in the Land Bank–South Harbor Branch as partial payment.^[14] This Motion remains pending in the RTC to date.

On 9 February 2006, petitioner filed with the CA a Petition for Certiorari with Prayer

for the Issuance of a Temporary Restraining Order and/or Writ of Preliminary Injunction.^[15]

The appellate court ruled that since the subject property was covered by a Torrens title, Presidential Decree No. 1529, or the Property Registration Decree (P. D. 1529), necessarily finds significance. Thus, it held that the RTC rightly applied Sec. 48. Accordingly, the CA issued its 29 September 2008 Decision,^[16] the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, the Petition for Certiorari is **DISMISSED**. The prayer for the issuance of a Writ of Preliminary Injunction is accordingly **DENIED**.

On 29 October 2008, petitioner filed a Motion for Reconsideration,^[17] but the motion was also denied in a Resolution dated 27 April 2009.^[18]

Hence, the instant Petition.

A Comment^[19] on the Petition was filed by private respondents on 1 September 2009, and a Reply^[20] thereto by petitioner on 27 January 2010.

ISSUE

From the foregoing, the sole issue submitted for resolution before this Court is whether petitioner may be barred from presenting evidence to assail the validity of respondents' title under TCT No. RT-11603 (383648).

THE COURT'S RULING

Petitioner argues that under Section 9, Rule 67 of the Rules of Court, if the ownership of a property to be expropriated is uncertain, the court in the **same** expropriation proceeding is also given authority to make a proper adjudication of the matter. Section 9 of Rule 67 reads:

SECTION 9. *Uncertain Ownership. Conflicting Claims.* — If the ownership of the property taken is uncertain, or there are conflicting claims to any part thereof, the court may order any sum or sums awarded as compensation for the property to be paid to the clerk of the court for the benefit of the persons adjudged in the same proceeding to be entitled thereto. But the judgment shall require the payment of the sum or sums awarded to either the defendant or the clerk before the plaintiff can enter upon the property, or retain it for the public use or purpose if entry has already been made.

This view is allegedly supported by *Republic v. Court of First Instance of Pampanga, presided formerly by Judge L. Pasicolan*^[21] (Republic) in which the trial court hearing the expropriation proceeding was also allowed to resolve the issue of ownership.

Petitioner further argues that the original Complaint was amended "precisely to

reflect the fact that herein private respondents, albeit ostensibly appearing as registered owners, are to be considered as mere claimants of one of the properties subject of the expropriation.” This is the reason why the RTC issued an Order declaring the property subject of conflicting claims.

Moreover, this being an *in rem* proceeding, “plaintiff Republic of the Philippines seeks the relief, both in the original and amended complaints, to transfer to plaintiff the titles to said parcels of land together with their improvements free from all liens and encumbrances. For this particular purpose, the expropriation suit is essentially a direct proceeding.”^[22]

Private respondents, on the other hand, invoke Section 48 of P. D. 1529, *viz*:

SECTION 48. *Certificate Not Subject to Collateral Attack.* — A certificate of title shall not be subject to collateral attack. It cannot be altered, modified, or cancelled except in a direct proceeding in accordance with law.

It is their contention that by allowing petitioner to present adversarial evidence, the court is in effect allowing respondents’ Torrens title to be collaterally attacked – an action prohibited by P. D. 1529.

We rule that petitioner may be allowed to present evidence to assert its ownership over the subject property, but for the sole purpose of determining who is entitled to just compensation.

I

Proper interpretation of Section 9, Rule 67

Proceeding from the principle of *jus regalia*, the right to eminent domain has always been considered as a fundamental state power that is inseparable from sovereignty.^[23] It is described as the State’s inherent power that need not be granted even by the Constitution,^[24] and as the government’s right to appropriate, in the nature of compulsory sale to the State, private property for public use or purpose.^[25]

Expropriation, or the exercise of the State’s right to eminent domain, is proscribed by the restraints of public use and just compensation.^[26] It is governed by Rule 67 of the Rules of Court, which presents procedural guidelines for the court to ensure that due process is observed and just compensation rightly paid to the private owners.

Indeed, this Court first had the occasion to interpret Section 9, Rule 67 in the case of *Republic*. In addressing the issue of “whether or not the court that hears the expropriation case has also jurisdiction to determine, in the same proceeding, the issue of ownership of the land sought to be condemned,” the Court answered in the affirmative:

The sole issue in this case, i.e., whether or not the court that hears the expropriation case has also jurisdiction to determine, in the same