

SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. 165742, June 30, 2009]

**TRI-CORP LAND & DEVELOPMENT, INC., REPRESENTED BY
SOLITA S. JIMENEZ-PAULINO, PETITIONER, VS. COURT OF
APPEALS AND GREYSTONE CORPORATION, RESPONDENTS.**

D E C I S I O N

QUISUMBING, J.:

This petition for certiorari under Rule 65 of the Rules of Court assails the Decision^[1] dated June 9, 2004 and Resolution^[2] dated September 21, 2004 of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CV No. 71285. The Court of Appeals affirmed the Orders dated November 15, 2000^[3] and June 11, 2001^[4] of the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Makati City, Branch 139 in LRC Case No. M-4086 dismissing the complaint filed by petitioner Tri-Corp Land and Development, Inc. (Tri-Corp) against respondent Greystone Corporation (Greystone) for lack of jurisdiction.

The facts, culled from the records, are as follows:

On February 12, 1998, Greystone executed in favor of Tri-Corp a Contract to Sell^[5] whereby Tri-Corp agreed to pay the purchase price, exclusive of interest, in the amount of P13,500,000 and payable in installments, of a unit of Casa Madeira, a residential condominium project located at Fatima Street, San Miguel Village, Makati City. Said unit, covered by Condominium Certificate of Title (CCT) No. 51232^[6] was to be used as a family residence of Tri-Corp's officers and stockholders. However, when Tri-Corp applied for membership with the San Miguel Village Homeowner's Association (SMVHA), it was denied and not given gate passes for its vehicles. The reason cited by SMVHA for Tri-Corp's denial of application was that the construction of the Casa Madeira condominium project was in violation of village restrictions annotated as Entry No. 31976^[7] and inscribed on October 9, 1961 at the back of Transfer Certificates of Title Nos. 205827^[8] and 205828^[9] covering the lots on which the condominium project was constructed. SMVHA filed a case against Greystone for this violation and prayed for the cancellation of the CCTs of the Casa Madeira condominium project before the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB). The case was docketed as HLURB Case No. REM-10045. Upon learning of the pending case, Tri-Corp filed a Complaint-in-Intervention^[10] in said case for suspension of payments until the issue of violation of the village restriction and validity of the CCT to the condominium unit sold shall have been resolved. Tri-Corp, likewise, filed a petition^[11] dated September 28, 2000, against Greystone before the HLURB for Suspension and Cancellation of Certificate of Registration and License to Sell of Greystone.

Greystone, in turn, filed an ejectment suit against Tri-Corp before the Metropolitan Trial Court of Makati City, for failure to pay under the Contract to Sell. The complaint

was docketed as Civil Case No. 63308. Tri-Corp was ejected by the Sheriff in the said case for its refusal to pay the *supersedeas* bond. Civil Case No. 63308 is still pending on appeal.^[12]

Tri-Corp also filed before the RTC of Makati City, sitting as a Land Registration Court, a Petition for Correction of Error /Misrepresentation in the Master Deed entered as Memorandum on TCTs Nos. 205827 and 205828 with prayer for Temporary Restraining Order and Injunction.^[13] The case was docketed as LRC Case No. M-4086. Tri-Corp alleged in its petition that Greystone used different descriptions of the condominium project in order to circumvent existing laws, rules and regulations on registration of real estate projects, to wit:

[1] Thus, to obtain approval of the San Miguel Village Association Construction and Permits Committee, **it styled its project as a "2-Unit Duplex Residence",** to conform with association rules.

[2] To obtain approval of Barangay Poblacion, Makati City, and the issuance of Certificate of Registration and Clearance No. 2758 on the same project, **it dubbed the same project as a "3-storey townhouse",** to suit barangay guidelines.

[3] To obtain from the City of Makati Building Permit No. C1096-01259, **it called the same project a "4-unit Residential Bldg." "Two-storey duplex",** to comply with zoning ordinances.

[4] To obtain from the HLURB the Preliminary Approval of Condominium Plan, **it described Casa Madeira as a "Condominium Project",** for the purpose of complying with PD 957 and its implementing rules.

[5] To obtain from the HLURB the Final Approval, **it called the project a "Condominium Plan/Subdivision Townhouse,** for the same purpose.

[6] To obtain from the HLURB a development permit, **it called the project a condominium** for the same purpose.

[7] To obtain from the HLURB a Certificate of Locational Viability for the same project, **it was designated as a "2 Storey with Attic Residential Condominium",** for the same purpose.

[8] To obtain from the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, National Capital Region an Environmental Compliance Certificate (ECC) **it designated the project as "four units, two storey with attic townhouse project",** to comply with the requirement of law.

[9] To obtain from the HLURB Certificate of Registration No. 97-09-3003, **it called Casa Madeira a condominium project,** for the purpose of complying with PD 957 and its implementing rules.

[10] These misrepresentations misled the petitioner as buyer and also

mis[led] the buying public as to the real nature of [the] project.^[14]
[Emphasis supplied.]

During the hearing on Tri-Corp's application for a Writ of Preliminary Injunction on September 28, 2000, Greystone raised the issue of jurisdiction. Greystone contended in its Memorandum^[15] that the RTC had no jurisdiction to try and decide the case because it involves an unsound real estate practice within the jurisdiction of the HLURB, Tri-Corp is not a party in interest, and same issues had been raised by Tri-Corp in the HLURB.

In an Order dated November 15, 2000, the RTC dismissed the case for lack of jurisdiction. The dispositive portion of the order states:

IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING PREMISES, based on law and jurisprudence, the **COURT** hereby **ORDERS** that:

(a) The prayer for Temporary Restraining Order and/or Writ of Preliminary Injunction is hereby **DENIED** for lack of merit.

(b) The Complaint dated 19 September 1990 (sic) is hereby **DISMISSED**, the same being within the exclusive jurisdiction of [the] HLURB pursuant to PD[s] 987 and 1344.

SO ORDERED.^[16]

Tri-Corp filed a motion for reconsideration but it was denied by the RTC in an Order dated June 11, 2001.

Tri-Corp appealed to the Court of Appeals. In a Decision promulgated on June 9, 2004, the Court of Appeals affirmed the orders of the RTC. The dispositive portion of the decision states:

UPON THE VIEW WE TAKE OF THIS CASE, THUS, the appealed orders dated November 15, 2000 and June 11, 2001 must be, as they hereby, are **AFFIRMED**. Without costs in this instance.

SO ORDERED.^[17]

Tri-Corp filed a motion for reconsideration but it was denied by the Court of Appeals in a Resolution promulgated on September 21, 2004 for being filed out of time and for being without merit.

Alleging that the Court of Appeals committed grave abuse of discretion in affirming the orders of the RTC, Tri-Corp filed this original action for certiorari under Rule 65.

Tri-Corp alleges that:

I.

THE APPELLATE COURT COMMITTED GRAVE ABUSE OF DISCRETION AMOUNTING TO LACK OR EXCESS OF JURISDICTION WHEN IT DECLARED THE MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AS HAVING BEEN