

FIFTH DIVISION

[CA-G.R. SP No. 130351, March 11, 2015]

DENNIS L. ESTRADA, PETITIONER, VS. HON. ARMANDO C. VELASCO, IN HIS CAPACITY AS PRESIDING JUDGE, REGIONAL TRIAL COURT, BRANCH 263 OF MARIKINA CITY, PUBLIC RESPONDENT.

INOCENTES REALTY AND SALES CORPORATION, PRIVATE RESPONDENT.

DECISION

TIJAM, J.:

This resolves Petitioner's Petition for Certiorari^[1] under Rule 65 of the Rules of Court seeking to annul and set aside the Decision^[2] dated March 12, 2013, and the Order^[3] dated May 8, 2013 of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 273 of Marikina City, in LRC Case No. 11-1285-MK, which ordered the issuance of a writ of possession in favor of Private Respondent.

The facts of the case as appearing in the records are as follows:

Due to alleged delinquencies in payment of real property tax, the City of Marikina, on November 22, 2007, conducted a public bidding covering a property with TCT No. 62473 ("subject property") owned by Spouses Cirilo and Priscilla Estrada, and occupied by their son, Petitioner Dennis Estrada ("Petitioner"). Private Respondent was the highest bidder. As a result, the local government of Marikina City issued a Certificate of Sale^[4] to Private Respondent. Upon the lapse of the redemption period without the Spouses Estrada exercising their right to redeem the property, a Final Deed of Sale^[5] was issued to Private Respondent.

On November 10, 2009, Private Respondent filed a Petition for Confirmation of Sale and Consolidation of Ownership^[6], docketed as LRC Case No. 09-1128-MK, with the Regional Trial Court, Branch 273 of Marikina City. On February 22, 2010, the trial court rendered a Decision^[7] confirming the sale and consolidating Private Respondent's title to the subject property. Said decision became final and executory on April 7, 2010.^[8] By virtue of such judgment, Transfer Certificate of Title No. N-62473 under the name of Spouses Cirilo and Priscilla Estrada was cancelled and a new one, Transfer Certificate of Title No. 009-2011002114 was issued to herein Private Respondent on January 9, 2011.

On March 7, 2011, a demand letter to vacate was sent to Spouses Estrada.^[9] The latter, however, refused to vacate the premises. This prompted Private Respondent to file an Ex-Parte Petition for the issuance of a Writ of Possession^[10] with the

Regional Trial Court, Branch 263 of Marikina City, which was docketed as LRC Case No. 11-1285-MK.

Petitioner filed a Motion to Dismiss^[11] the ex-parte petition for the issuance of a writ of possession on the ground that the trial court has no jurisdiction to issue the writs of possession in cases of public sale conducted by a local government.

On January 12, 2012, the trial court denied the motion to dismiss.^[12] Petitioner filed a Motion for Reconsideration^[13] which was also denied^[14] by Public Respondent. The trial court therefore deemed the case submitted for decision.

Thereafter, Petitioner filed a Motion for Clarification and Partial Reconsideration^[15], which was partially granted by the Public Respondent by allowing Private Respondent to present evidence to support its claim.

After Private Respondent presented its lone witness and rested its case, the same was submitted for decision.

On March 12, 2013, the Public Respondent rendered the assailed Decision, the dispositive portion of which reads:

"WHEREFORE, above premises considered, the court hereby GRANTS the instant petition.

Let therefore a writ of possession over the property covered by TCT No. 009-2011002114 be issued in favor of Petitioner Inocentes Realty and Sales Corporation.

SO ORDERED."^[16]

On April 5, 2013, Petitioner filed a Motion for Reconsideration.^[17] Then on May 8, 2013, the Public respondent denied the same.^[18]

Feeling aggrieved, Petitioner filed the instant Petition for Certiorari raising the following assignment of errors:

"I

THE COURT A QUO GRAVELY ERRED WHEN IT ENTERTAINED THE SUBJECT PETITION WHEN THE BODY OF THE PETITION CLEARLY PLEADED AN ACTION FOR UNLAWFUL DETAINER WHICH IS COGNIZABLE BY METROPOLITAN TRIAL COURT.

II

THE COURT A QUO GRAVELY ERRED WHEN IT ENTERTAINED THE SUBJECT PETITION FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT OF POSSESSION WHEN THERE IS NO LAW CONFERRING THE LOWER COURT JURISDICTION TO ISSUE WRIT OF POSSESSION BY VIRTUE OF A

PUBLIC BIDDING UNDER THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT CODE.

III

THE COURT A QUO GRAVELY ERRED WHEN IT GRANTED THE EX-PARTE PETITION FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT OF POSSESSION WITHOUT FACTUAL AND LEGAL BASIS AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 1 RULE 36 OF THE REVISED RULES OF COURT AND SECTION 14 ARTICLE VIII OF THE 1987 CONSTITUTION.

IV

THE COURT A QUO GRAVELY ERRED WHEN IT GRANTED THE SUBJECT PETITION FOR ISSUANCE OF WRIT OF POSSESSION BASED ON ACT 3135 AS AMENDED WHEN THE PRIVATE RESPONDENT MISERABLY FAILED TO ESTABLISH ANY RIGHT UNDER THE SAID LAW."

Petitioner contends that Public Respondent has no jurisdiction to issue the writ of possession with respect to a land acquired through public sale conducted by the local government of Marikina. He further questions the propriety of the issuance of a writ of possession considering that the allegations in the petition filed before the trial court would reveal that it is actually an unlawful detainer case. He also claims that Private Respondent failed to establish, by evidence, his right to the issuance of a writ of possession. Finally, Petitioner claims that the assailed Decision failed to cite its factual and legal basis in violation of Sec. 1 Rule 36 of the Rules of Court and Sec. 14 of Art. VIII of the 1987 Philippine Constitution.

Meanwhile, Private Respondent contends that although not granted under the Local Government Code (LGC), the remedy of a petition for the issuance of a writ of possession is available in every case in favor of a property owner who possesses title thereto, as against an occupant in the said property.

The petition lacks merit.

As to the statutory basis of RTC's jurisdiction to issue the instant writ of possession, P.D. 1529 (Property Registration Decree) and the case of *Sps. Cloma v. Court of Appeals*^[19] are categorical on the matter. The RTC has jurisdiction to issue writs of possession as a result of a tax sale.

Sec. 2 of P. D. 1529 provides:

"Section 2. Nature of registration proceedings; jurisdiction of courts. Judicial proceedings for the registration of lands throughout the Philippines shall be in rem and shall be based on the generally accepted principles underlying the Torrens system.

Courts of First Instance shall have exclusive jurisdiction over all applications for original registration of title to lands, including improvements and interests therein, and **over all petitions filed after original registration of title, with power to hear and determine all questions arising upon such applications or petitions.** The court

through its clerk of court shall furnish the Land Registration Commission with two certified copies of all pleadings, exhibits, orders, and decisions filed or issued in applications or petitions for land registration, with the exception of stenographic notes, within five days from the filing or issuance thereof." (Emphasis supplied)

In *Sps. Cloma v. Court of Appeals*^[20], the High Court explained:

"Section 2 of PD 1529 also clearly rejects the thesis of petitioners that the trial court cannot issue a writ of possession to effectuate the result of a tax sale, thus:

'SECTION 2. Nature of registration proceedings; jurisdiction of courts. — . . .'

xxx

Obviously, **petitioners failed to consider that PD 1529 has long abolished the difference between the general jurisdiction of a regular court and the limited jurisdiction of a registration court.**" (Emphasis supplied)

It appearing that this ruling has not been overturned by the Supreme Court in recent cases, We find the same applicable in the case at bar. We therefore hold that the Public Respondent has jurisdiction to issue the writ of possession in favor of Private Respondent.

This general jurisdiction of the RTC to rule on all petitions after the original registration of title has likewise been reiterated by the Supreme Court in *Concepcion and Fil-Estate Management, Inc. v. Trono*.^[21]

We likewise find without merit Petitioner's claim that the petition for writ of possession is actually an unlawful detainer case, cognizable by the MTC.

At the outset it bears to point out that the nature of an action, as well as which court or body has jurisdiction over it, is determined based on the allegations contained in the complaint of the plaintiff, irrespective of whether or not the plaintiff is entitled to recover upon all or some of the claims asserted therein.^[22] In this case, allegations in the petition filed before the trial court clearly convey an application for a writ of possession and not an unlawful detainer case.

Unlawful detainer is a summary action for the recovery of possession of real property. This action may be filed by a lessor, vendor, or vendee or other person against whom the possession of any land or building is unlawfully withheld after the expiration or termination of the right to hold possession by virtue of a contract, express or implied.^[23]

There is no contract, express or implied present in the instant case. Hence, this case does not involve a case of unlawful detainer since the necessary element of expiration or termination of the right to possess by virtue of a contract is absent.

On the contrary, it clearly appears that the petition was filed as an offshoot of the