

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. NO. 138550, October 14, 2005]

**AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL, INC., PETITIONER, VS.
NOEL CORDERO, DEFENDANT.**

D E C I S I O N

SANDOVAL-GUTIERREZ, J.:

This is a petition for review on certiorari of the Decision^[1] of the Court of Appeals dated April 30, 1999 in CA-G.R. CV No. 51671, entitled, "*Noel Cordero, Plaintiff-Appellee versus American Express International, Inc., Defendant-Appellant.*"

Petitioner is a foreign corporation that issues charge cards to its customers, which the latter then use to purchase goods and services at accredited merchants worldwide. Sometime in 1988, Nilda Cordero, wife of respondent Noel Cordero, applied for and was issued an American Express charge card with No. 3769-895901-010020. The issuance of the charge card was covered by an Amex Cardmember Agreement. As cardholder, Nilda, upon signing the back portion of the card, manifested her acceptance of the terms of the Agreement.

An extension charge card, with No. 3769-895901-01010, was likewise issued to respondent Noel Cordero which he also signed.^[2]

On November 29, 1991, respondent, together with his wife, Nilda, daughter, sisters-in-law and uncle-in-law, went on a three-day holiday trip to Hong Kong. In the early evening of November 30, 1991, at about 7:00 o'clock, the group went to the Watson's Chemist Shop located at 277C Ocean Gallery, Kowloon, Hong Kong. Noel picked up some chocolate candies and handed to the sales clerk his American Express extension charge card to pay for his purchases. The sales clerk verified the card by making a telephone call to the American Express Office in Hong Kong. Moments later, Susan Chong, the store manager, emerged from behind the counter and informed respondent that she had to confiscate the card. Thereupon, she cut respondent's American Express card in half with a pair of scissors. This, according to respondent, caused him embarrassment and humiliation considering that it was done in front of his family and the other customers lined up at the check-out counter. Hence, Nilda had to pay for the purchases using her own American Express charge card.^[3]

When they returned to the Excelsior Hotel, Nilda called up petitioner's Office in Hong Kong. She was able to talk to Senior Authorizer Johnny Chen, who informed her that on November 1, 1991, a person in Hong Kong attempted to use a charge card with the same number as respondent's card. The Hong Kong American Express Office called up respondent and after determining that he was in Manila and not in Hong Kong, placed his card in the "Inspect Airwarn Support System." This is the system utilized by petitioner as a protection both for the company and the cardholders

against the fraudulent use of their charge cards. Once a card suspected of unauthorized use is placed in the system, the person to whom the card is tendered must verify the identity of the holder. If the true identity of the card owner is established, the card is honored and the charges are approved. Otherwise, the card is revoked or confiscated.^[4]

When the Watson's sales clerk called up petitioner's Hong Kong Office, its representative said he wants to talk to respondent in order to verify the latter's identity, pursuant to the procedure observed under the "Inspect Airwarn Support System." However, respondent refused. Consequently, petitioner's representative was unable to establish the identity of the cardholder.^[5] This led to the confiscation of respondent's card.

On March 31, 1992, respondent filed with the Regional Trial Court, Branch V, Manila, a complaint for damages against petitioner, docketed as Civil Case No. 92-60807. He prayed for the award of moral damages and exemplary damages, as well as attorney's fees as a result of the humiliation he suffered.

The trial court found that "the inexcusable failure of defendant (petitioner herein) to inform plaintiff (respondent herein) of the November 1, 1991 incident despite sufficient time was the proximate cause of the confiscation and cutting of plaintiff's extension card which exposed the latter to public humiliation for which defendant should be held liable."^[6] On February 20, 1995, the trial court promulgated its Decision, the dispositive portion of which reads:

"WHEREFORE, judgment is hereby rendered in favor of the plaintiff and against the defendant, ordering the latter to pay the former the following amounts, namely:

- a) The sum of P300,000.00 as and by way of moral damages;
- b) The sum of P200,000.00 as exemplary damages;
- c) The sum of P100,000.00 as and for reasonable attorney's fees; and
- d) The costs of the suit.

SO ORDERED."^[7]

Upon appeal, the Court of Appeals rendered the assailed Decision affirming the trial court's Decision with modification in the sense that the amounts of damages awarded were reduced, thus:

"WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, the appealed decision dated February 20, 1995 of the Regional Trial Court of Manila, Branch V, in Civil Case No. 92-60807 is hereby **AFFIRMED**, subject to modifications with respect to the amount of damages awarded, which are reduced as follows:

- (a) Moral damages from P300,000.00 to P150,000.00; and
- (b) Exemplary damages from P200,000.00 to P100,000.00.

No pronouncement as to costs.

SO ORDERED."

Hence, the instant petition raising the following issues:

"A. Whether the lower courts gravely erred in attributing the "public humiliation" allegedly suffered by Cordero to Amex.

B. Whether the lower courts gravely erred in holding Amex liable to Cordero for moral damages, exemplary damages and attorney's fees."^[8]

Respondent filed his comment contending in the main that the petition raises questions of fact beyond this Court's domain.

While it is true that under Rule 45 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure, as amended, this Court may review only errors of law, however, this rule admits of well-known recognized exceptions, thus:

". . . (1) the conclusion is a finding grounded entirely on speculation, surmise and conjecture; (2) the inference made is manifestly mistaken; (3) there is grave abuse of discretion; (4) the judgment is based on a misapprehension of facts; (5) the findings of fact are conflicting; (6) the Court of Appeals went beyond the issues of the case and its findings are contrary to the admissions of both parties; (7) the findings of fact of the Court of Appeals are contrary to those of the trial court; (8) said findings of fact are conclusions without citation of specific evidence on which they are based; (9) the facts set forth in the petition are not disputed by the respondents; and (10) the findings of fact of the Court of Appeals are premised on the supposed absence of evidence and contradicted by the evidence on record."^[9]

In this case, the inference made by the courts below is manifestly mistaken. Therefore, we are justified in reviewing the records of this case and rendering judgment based on our own findings.

In his complaint, respondent claimed that he suffered embarrassment and humiliation because his card was unceremoniously confiscated and cut in half by Susan Chong of Watson's Chemist Shop.

Respondent anchors his cause of action on the following provision of the Civil Code:

"Art. 2176. Whoever by act or omission causes damage to another, there being fault or negligence, is obliged to pay for the damage done. Such fault or negligence, if there is no pre-existing contractual relation between the parties, is called a quasi-delict and is governed by the provisions of this Chapter."^[10]

In order that an obligation based on quasi-delict may arise, there must be no pre-existing contractual relation between the parties. But there are exceptions. There may be an action for quasi-delict notwithstanding that there is a subsisting contract between the parties. A liability for tort may arise even under a contract, where tort