

THIRD DIVISION

[CA-G.R. SP NO. 133054, June 26, 2014]

**SPOUSES ANTONIO S. BILOG AND PRECIOSA BILOG,
PETITIONERS, V. HON. PRESIDING JUDGE OF RTC BRANCH 78,
CITY OF MALOLOS, BULACAN, FEEDMIX SPECIALIST, INC. II,
REPRESENTED BY ACHILLES ARRIAGA, RESPONDENTS.**

D E C I S I O N

DE GUIA-SALVADOR, R., J.:

Filed pursuant to Rule 65 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure, the instant Petition for Certiorari^[1] seeks the nullification of the Order^[2] dated November 12, 2013 issued by the Regional Trial Court of Malolos City, Bulacan, Branch 78 (***court a quo***), in Civil Case No. 838-M-2009, which granted the Motion for Execution filed by private respondent Feedmix Specialist, Inc. II (***Feedmix***). The dispositive portion of the Order reads:

"WHEREFORE, it appearing from the record that [the] decision of this Court dated April 27, 2010 had already become final and executory, the "Motion for Execution" filed by the plaintiff [Feedmix], through counsel, on October 4, 2013 is hereby **GRANTED**. Accordingly, let a writ of execution be issued in favor of the plaintiff for the immediate execution of the above-mentioned decision."^[3]

The Facts

Private respondent Feedmix is a domestic corporation engaged in the manufacturing, processing, packing, repacking and selling of fish feeds. For the period of June to August 2007, petitioners Spouses Antonio and Preciosa Bilog (***Spouses Bilog***) obtained a credit term from Feedmix, which they used for purchasing fish feed for resale and use in their business of breeding *tilapia*.^[4] Pursuant thereto, Feedmix delivered and sold on credit to the Spouses Bilog 1,792, more or less, bags of fish feeds.^[5] As payment therefor, the Spouses Bilog issued a check in the amount of P969,612.00.^[6] However, when Feedmix presented it for payment, the check was dishonored for the reason of "Account Closed".^[7] Feedmix thus demanded payment, but the demand went unheeded.^[8]

On December 1, 2009, Feedmix, through its representative Achilles Arriaga, filed a complaint^[9] before the court *a quo* for Sum of Money with Preliminary Attachment.

The Spouses Bilog did not file an answer.^[10] Meanwhile, on March 8, 2010, Feedmix and the Spouses Bilog entered into a Compromise Agreement with the following terms and conditions, *viz*:

1. "The defendants acknowledge their partial indebtedness to the plaintiff in the amount of **Nine Hundred Sixty Nine Thousand Six Hundred Twelve Pesos (Php969,612.00)** which is the subject of the instant case and is a part of their principal obligation of Php2,648,829 consisting of bounced checks which is a just, valid, due and demandable obligation arising from their credit purchases of its Feedmix products from the plaintiff.

2. To put an end to the instant litigation, defendants agree to settle said obligation by paying fully the said amount of Php969,612.00 in equal monthly installments for twenty-four (24) months until paid starting on March 26, 2010.

3. To secure the full and faithful payment of the subject obligation in the manner provided above, defendants have issued twenty-four postdated checks to facilitate payment and executed a Real Estate Mortgage conveying their real estate covered by Tax Declaration No. 007-01568 of Laurel, Batangas free from liens and encumbrances.

4. Should the defendants fail to pay any of the amounts when due, the defendants agree that plaintiff will be entitled to execution on the unpaid amount and to all the claims in the complaint, i.e., payment of the balance of the amount stated in the complaint plus interest thereon at the rate of 18% per annum and another 1.5% a month as surcharge, and attorney's fees of 25% of the total sum due plus the costs of suit without further proof or proceedings and shall entitle the plaintiff to judgment and to the issuance of a writ of execution.

5. Plaintiffs accepts *[sic]* these covenants, warranties and stipulations and in consideration of them, particularly the promise of payment, the issuance of checks and the execution of the mortgage, hereby waives, relinquishes, and renounces *[sic]* all its claims and causes of action stated in its complaint for the purpose of putting an end to the instant litigation.

6. Defendant hereby declares that all the stipulations have been explained to them and have fully understood their meaning and import defendant Antonio being a professional orthodontist *[sic]* with years of experience as such while defendant Presciosa is a business woman and a college graduate with a degree in Hotel and Restaurant Management. **They further declares *[sic]* that they refused to be represented by counsel in the instant case** and instead invoked the provisions of Section 34 Rule 138 of the Rules of Court, as amended, which authorizes a party litigant to personally conduct his litigation since the instant case is non-complicated."^[11] (Emphasis supplied)

xxx xxx xxx

On April 27, 2010, the court *a quo* rendered a Decision^[12] approving the Compromise Agreement. However, the Spouses Bilog failed to comply with its terms.^[13] Hence, on July 17, 2013, Feedmix filed a Motion for Execution.^[14]

In an effort to prevent the execution of the Decision, on October 4, 2013, the Spouses Bilog filed their Comment and Opposition^[15] to Feedmix's Motion for Execution, alleging fraud, mistake and undue influence in the execution of the Compromise Agreement and ambiguity in the total amount Feedmix seeks to collect.^[16]

On November 12, 2013, the court *a quo* issued the assailed Order^[17] granting the Motion for Execution, ratiocinating as follows:

xxx xxx xxx

"Basic is the rule that judgment based on a compromise agreement is final, unappealable, and immediately executory.

If one of the parties claims that his consent was obtained through fraud, mistake, or duress, he must file a motion with the trial court that approved the compromise agreement to reconsider the judgment and nullify or set aside said contract on any of the said grounds for annulment of contract within 15 days from notice of judgment. Under Rule 37, said party can either file a motion for new trial or reconsideration. Xxx

xxx This motion is the most plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in law to assail a judgment based on a compromise agreement which, even if it is immediately executory, can still be annulled for vices of consent or forgery.

However, the remedies can no longer be pursued by the defendant in the instant case since the judgment had long become final and executory.

Secondly, a review of the record would show that **the compromise agreement was duly signed by the parties.** xxx

Finally, the mere fact that the Compromise Agreement favors one party does not render it invalid." (Emphasis supplied)

xxx xxx xxx

The Issues

Aggrieved, the Spouses Bilog filed the instant Petition for Certiorari,^[18] urging the nullification of the assailed Order, on the ground that the Compromise Agreement was executed through fraud, mistake and undue influence.

The Spouses Bilog further assert that they were just prevailed upon to sign said agreement without fully understanding its import and contents. They were not even assisted by counsel during its signing. Furthermore, the terms of the agreement are iniquitous and unconscionable, and the total amount of their liability is unclear.^[19] Both the Compromise Agreement and the Real Estate Mortgage indicate a total obligation of P2,648,829.00, whereas the complaint seeks to collect only the amount of P969,612.00, while the Demand Letter dated July 16, 2013 urges payment of the sum of P3,631,330.03.^[20]

On the other hand, private respondent Feedmix maintains that the Compromise Agreement was freely and voluntarily executed by both parties with full comprehension of its import, as well as its terms and conditions. The Spouses Bilog are college graduates who had no reason not to be able to fully understand the import of the Compromise Agreement. They even refused to be assisted by a counsel during its execution. Moreover, having been approved by respondent judge after finding the terms and conditions embodied therein to be not contrary to law, morals or public policy, the Compromise Agreement has the force of law and the effect of *res judicata*. Lastly, Feedmix clarified the purported disparity in the total amount of petitioners' obligation, explaining that the only amount sought to be collected under the Compromise Agreement is P969,612.00, which represents the value of the unpaid merchandise.^[21]

The Court's Ruling

Upon a judicious persual of the records, We find the instant Petition bereft of merit.

A compromise is a contract whereby parties, by making reciprocal concessions, avoid a litigation or put an end to one already commenced.^[22] Once stamped with judicial *imprimatur*, the compromise agreement transcends its identity as a mere contract binding only upon the parties thereto, and becomes a judgment subject to execution in accordance with the Rules,^[23] bearing the force and effect of *res judicata*.^[24] Parenthetically, the nonfulfillment of the terms and conditions embodied in the compromise agreement justifies the issuance of a writ of execution, which becomes a ministerial duty of the court,^[25] enforceable by *mandamus*.^[26] Consequently, a judgment rendered on the basis of a compromise is not appealable and is immediately executory, unless a motion is filed to set aside the compromise on the ground of fraud, mistake or duress.^[27]

In the case at bar, Feedmix and the Spouses Bilog entered into a Compromise Agreement on March 8, 2010, thereby terminating the suit for Collection of Sum of Money filed by the former against the latter. The Compromise Agreement was approved by the court *a quo* on April 27, 2010, and, hence, became a judgment subject to execution in accordance with the Rules of Court.^[28] However, the Spouses Bilog sought to prevent its execution on their contention that their consent thereto was vitiated by fraud, mistake and undue influence.

We are unswayed by the foregoing contention.

Article 2038 of the New Civil Code provides that a compromise in which there is mistake, fraud, violence, intimidation, undue influence, or falsity of documents is voidable.^[29] Accordingly, one who alleges fraud, deceit, or misrepresentation in the execution of the Compromise Agreement is bound to prove the same^[30] by full, clear and convincing evidence, and not merely by a preponderance thereof.^[31] Furthermore, in determining whether the consent of the contracting parties was vitiated, the courts are given wide latitude in weighing the facts or circumstances considering the age, physical infirmity, intelligence, relationship and conduct of the parties during the execution of the contract and subsequent thereto.^[32] Moreover, bad faith and fraud are allegations of fact that demand clear and convincing proof. They are never presumed as they are serious accusations that can be so conveniently and casually invoked.^[33]