

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. No. 164584, June 22, 2009]

**PHILIP MATTHEWS, PETITIONER, VS. BENJAMIN A. TAYLOR AND
JOSELYN C. TAYLOR, RESPONDENTS.**

DECISION

NACHURA, J.:

Assailed in this petition for review on *certiorari* are the Court of Appeals (CA) December 19, 2003 Decision^[1] and July 14, 2004 Resolution^[2] in CA-G.R. CV No. 59573. The assailed decision affirmed and upheld the June 30, 1997 Decision^[3] of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Branch 8, Kalibo, Aklan in Civil Case No. 4632 for *Declaration of Nullity of Agreement of Lease with Damages*.

On June 30, 1988, respondent Benjamin A. Taylor (Benjamin), a British subject, married Joselyn C. Taylor (Joselyn), a 17-year old Filipina.^[4] On June 9, 1989, while their marriage was subsisting, Joselyn bought from Diosa M. Martin a 1,294 square-meter lot (Boracay property) situated at Manoc-Manoc, Boracay Island, Malay, Aklan, for and in consideration of P129,000.00.^[5] The sale was allegedly financed by Benjamin.^[6] Joselyn and Benjamin, also using the latter's funds, constructed improvements thereon and eventually converted the property to a vacation and tourist resort known as the Admiral Ben Bow Inn.^[7] All required permits and licenses for the operation of the resort were obtained in the name of Ginna Celestino, Joselyn's sister.^[8]

However, Benjamin and Joselyn had a falling out, and Joselyn ran away with Kim Philippsen. On June 8, 1992, Joselyn executed a Special Power of Attorney (SPA) in favor of Benjamin, authorizing the latter to maintain, sell, lease, and sub-lease and otherwise enter into contract with third parties with respect to their Boracay property.^[9]

On July 20, 1992, Joselyn as lessor and petitioner Philip Matthews as lessee, entered into an Agreement of Lease^[10] (Agreement) involving the Boracay property for a period of 25 years, with an annual rental of P12,000.00. The agreement was signed by the parties and executed before a Notary Public. Petitioner thereafter took possession of the property and renamed the resort as Music Garden Resort.

Claiming that the Agreement was null and void since it was entered into by Joselyn without his (Benjamin's) consent, Benjamin instituted an action for Declaration of Nullity of Agreement of Lease with Damages^[11] against Joselyn and the petitioner. Benjamin claimed that his funds were used in the acquisition and improvement of the Boracay property, and coupled with the fact that he was Joselyn's husband, any transaction involving said property required his consent.

No Answer was filed, hence, the RTC declared Joselyn and the petitioner in default. On March 14, 1994, the RTC rendered judgment by default declaring the Agreement null and void.^[12] The decision was, however, set aside by the CA in CA-G.R. SP No. 34054.^[13] The CA also ordered the RTC to allow the petitioner to file his Answer, and to conduct further proceedings.

In his Answer,^[14] petitioner claimed good faith in transacting with Joselyn. Since Joselyn appeared to be the owner of the Boracay property, he found it unnecessary to obtain the consent of Benjamin. Moreover, as appearing in the Agreement, Benjamin signed as a witness to the contract, indicating his knowledge of the transaction and, impliedly, his conformity to the agreement entered into by his wife. Benjamin was, therefore, estopped from questioning the validity of the Agreement.

There being no amicable settlement during the pre-trial, trial on the merits ensued.

On June 30, 1997, the RTC disposed of the case in this manner:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, judgment is hereby rendered in favor of the plaintiff and against the defendants as follows:

1. The Agreement of Lease dated July 20, 1992 consisting of eight (8) pages (Exhibits "T", "T-1", "T-2", "T-3", "T-4", "T-5", "T-6" and "T-7") entered into by and between Joselyn C. Taylor and Philip Matthews before Notary Public Lenito T. Serrano under Doc. No. 390, Page 79, Book I, Series of 1992 is hereby declared NULL and VOID;
2. Defendants are hereby ordered, jointly and severally, to pay plaintiff the sum of SIXTEEN THOUSAND (P16,000.00) PESOS as damages representing unrealized income for the residential building and cottages computed monthly from July 1992 up to the time the property in question is restored to plaintiff; and
3. Defendants are hereby ordered, jointly and severally, to pay plaintiff the sum of TWENTY THOUSAND (P20,000.00) PESOS, Philippine Currency, for attorney's fees and other incidental expenses.

SO ORDERED.^[15]

The RTC considered the Boracay property as community property of Benjamin and Joselyn; thus, the consent of the spouses was necessary to validate any contract involving the property. Benjamin's right over the Boracay property was bolstered by the court's findings that the property was purchased and improved through funds provided by Benjamin. Although the Agreement was evidenced by a public document, the trial court refused to consider the alleged participation of Benjamin in the questioned transaction primarily because his signature appeared only on the last page of the document and not on every page thereof.

On appeal to the CA, petitioner still failed to obtain a favorable decision. In its December 19, 2003 Decision,^[16] the CA affirmed the conclusions made by the RTC. The appellate court was of the view that if, indeed, Benjamin was a willing

participant in the questioned transaction, the parties to the Agreement should have used the phrase "with my consent" instead of "signed in the presence of." The CA noted that Joselyn already prepared an SPA in favor of Benjamin involving the Boracay property; it was therefore unnecessary for Joselyn to participate in the execution of the Agreement. Taken together, these circumstances yielded the inevitable conclusion that the contract was null and void having been entered into by Joselyn without the consent of Benjamin.

Aggrieved, petitioner now comes before this Court in this petition for review on *certiorari* based on the following grounds:

4.1. THE MARITAL CONSENT OF RESPONDENT BENJAMIN TAYLOR IS NOT REQUIRED IN THE AGREEMENT OF LEASE DATED 20 JULY 1992. GRANTING *ARGUENDO* THAT HIS CONSENT IS REQUIRED, BENJAMIN TAYLOR IS DEEMED TO HAVE GIVEN HIS CONSENT WHEN HE AFFIXED HIS SIGNATURE IN THE AGREEMENT OF LEASE AS WITNESS IN THE LIGHT OF THE RULING OF THE SUPREME COURT IN THE CASE OF SPOUSES PELAYO VS. MELKI PEREZ, G.R. NO. 141323, JUNE 8, 2005.

4.2. THE PARCEL OF LAND SUBJECT OF THE AGREEMENT OF LEASE IS THE EXCLUSIVE PROPERTY OF JOCELYN C. TAYLOR, A FILIPINO CITIZEN, IN THE LIGHT OF CHEESMAN VS. IAC, G.R. NO. 74833, JANUARY 21, 1991.

4.3. THE COURTS A *QUO* ERRONEOUSLY APPLIED ARTICLE 96 OF THE FAMILY CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES WHICH IS A PROVISION REFERRING TO THE ABSOLUTE COMMUNITY OF PROPERTY. THE PROPERTY REGIME GOVERNING THE PROPERTY RELATIONS OF BENJAMIN TAYLOR AND JOSELYN TAYLOR IS THE CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP OF GAINS BECAUSE THEY WERE MARRIED ON 30 JUNE 1988 WHICH IS PRIOR TO THE EFFECTIVITY OF THE FAMILY CODE. ARTICLE 96 OF THE FAMILY CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES FINDS NO APPLICATION IN THIS CASE.

4.4. THE HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS IGNORED THE PRESUMPTION OF REGULARITY IN THE EXECUTION OF NOTARIAL DOCUMENTS.

4.5. THE HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS FAILED TO PASS UPON THE COUNTERCLAIM OF PETITIONER DESPITE THE FACT THAT IT WAS NOT CONTESTED AND DESPITE THE PRESENTATION OF EVIDENCE ESTABLISHING SAID CLAIM.^[17]

The petition is impressed with merit.

In fine, we are called upon to determine the validity of an Agreement of Lease of a parcel of land entered into by a Filipino wife without the consent of her British husband. In addressing the matter before us, we are confronted not only with civil law or conflicts of law issues, but more importantly, with a constitutional question.

It is undisputed that Joselyn acquired the Boracay property in 1989. Said acquisition was evidenced by a Deed of Sale with Joselyn as the vendee. The property was also declared for taxation purposes under her name. When Joselyn leased the property to petitioner, Benjamin sought the nullification of the contract on

two grounds: *first*, that he was the actual owner of the property since he provided the funds used in purchasing the same; and *second*, that Joselyn could not enter into a valid contract involving the subject property without his consent.

The trial and appellate courts both focused on the property relations of petitioner and respondent in light of the Civil Code and Family Code provisions. They, however, failed to observe the applicable constitutional principles, which, in fact, are the more decisive.

Section 7, Article XII of the 1987 Constitution states:^[18]

Section 7. Save in cases of hereditary succession, no private lands shall be transferred or conveyed except to individuals, corporations, or associations qualified to acquire or hold lands of the public domain.

Aliens, whether individuals or corporations, have been disqualified from acquiring lands of the public domain. Hence, by virtue of the aforecited constitutional provision, they are also disqualified from acquiring private lands.^[19] The primary purpose of this constitutional provision is the conservation of the national patrimony.^[20] Our fundamental law cannot be any clearer. The right to acquire lands of the public domain is reserved only to Filipino citizens or corporations at least sixty percent of the capital of which is owned by Filipinos.^[21]

In *Krivenko v. Register of Deeds*,^[22] cited in *Muller v. Muller*,^[23] we had the occasion to explain the constitutional prohibition:

Under Section 1 of Article XIII of the Constitution, "natural resources, with the exception of public agricultural land, shall not be alienated," and with respect to public agricultural lands, their alienation is limited to Filipino citizens. But this constitutional purpose conserving agricultural resources in the hands of Filipino citizens may easily be defeated by the Filipino citizens themselves who may alienate their agricultural lands in favor of aliens. It is partly to prevent this result that Section 5 is included in Article XIII, and it reads as follows:

"Section 5. Save in cases of hereditary succession, no private agricultural land will be transferred or assigned except to individuals, corporations, or associations qualified to acquire or hold lands of the public domain in the Philippines."

This constitutional provision closes the only remaining avenue through which agricultural resources may leak into alien's hands. It would certainly be futile to prohibit the alienation of public agricultural lands to aliens if, after all, they may be freely so alienated upon their becoming private agricultural lands in the hands of Filipino citizens. x x x

x x x x

If the term "private agricultural lands" is to be construed as not including residential lots or lands not strictly agricultural, the result would be that "aliens may freely acquire and possess not only residential lots and houses for themselves but entire subdivisions, and whole towns and