

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 174251, December 15, 2010]

**RAUL PALOMATA, PETITIONER, VS. NESTOR COLMENARES AND
TERESA GURREA, RESPONDENTS.**

D E C I S I O N

DEL CASTILLO, J.:

Factual findings of trial and appellate courts that are well-supported by the evidence on record are binding on this Court.

This is a Petition for Review^[1] under Rule 45 assailing the December 21, 2005 Decision,^[2] as well as the July 18, 2006 Resolution^[3] in CA-G.R. CV No. 55205. The dispositive portion of the assailed Decision reads:

WHEREFORE and in the light of the foregoing, the *Decision* appealed from is **AFFIRMED** *in toto*.

SO ORDERED.^[4]

Factual antecedents

This case involves a parcel of land along the Camambugan Creek in Balasan, Iloilo on which stand petitioner Raul Palomata's (Raul) house and *talyer*. Letecia Colmenares (Letecia),^[5] claiming ownership over the said land, filed a criminal complaint for squatting against Raul in 1981.^[6] However, for reasons undisclosed by the records, the case was eventually dismissed.^[7]

In order to prevent further ejectment from the subject property, Raul, together with his father Alipio, filed a complaint in 1984 before Branch 30 of the Iloilo City Regional Trial Court, sitting as a Court of Agrarian Relations (CAR), for "maintenance and damages" against Letecia, her son Nestor Colmenares, and Teresa Gurrea.^[8] The complaint alleged that Alipio Palomata (Alipio) was the bona fide agricultural lessee of Letecia. After the issuance of Presidential Decree No. 27,^[9] an approximate two-hectare portion of Colmenares' landholding was awarded to Alipio, who was issued Certificate of Land Transfer (CLT) No. 10055.^[10] Raul contended that the subject property occupied by his house and *talyer* was part of Alipio's farmlot. Thus, Raul and Alipio prayed to be maintained in the subject property and that the Colmenareses be ordered to refrain from ejecting the Palomatas from the subject property.^[11]

The Colmenareses admitted that Alipio was their agricultural lessee but denied any

knowledge of the survey which led to the issuance of the CLT in Alipio's favor. The Colmenareses countered that the property claimed by Raul is within their subdivision, not within the agricultural land tenanted by Alipio.^[12] They prayed that the subject property be excluded from Alipio's land transfer certificate.^[13] Should the property be included in Alipio's CLT, they prayed that the same be declared null and void because they were not informed of the survey conducted by the Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR).^[14]

During the trial, both parties attempted to prove their right to the subject property. Aside from presenting Alipio's CLT, Raul presented two DAR investigation reports, which stated that the survey conducted by the Bureau of Lands revealed that the subject property lies within Alipio's farmlot. These two surveys were conducted because of the conflict that ensued between the Palomatas and the Colmenareses.^[15] However, both these surveys were concluded without notifying the Colmenareses.^[16] Raul also presented Alipio's tax declaration^[17] covering the awarded farmlot.

On the other hand, the Colmenareses presented two tax declarations, which covered Lots 2-A^[18] and 36-A.^[19] The *talyer* allegedly occupies portions of Lot 36-A (207 square meters) and Lot 2-A (162 square meters).^[20] They likewise assailed the validity of the surveys conducted by the Bureau of Lands on the basis that these were conducted without the presence of officials from the DAR and without notifying the Colmenareses.

Ruling of the Regional Trial Court^[21]

Based on the evidence presented by the contesting parties, the trial court ruled that the subject property was *not* part of Alipio's farmlot. The trial court noted that Alipio's tax declaration itself cited the Camambugan Creek as the southern boundary of his farmlot. However, upon ocular inspection, the court observed that the subject property lies across the Camambugan Creek. The trial court thus concluded that the subject property is physically separate from, and is not included in, Alipio's farmlot.^[22]

The trial court gave little credence to the surveys conducted by the Bureau of Lands given that these were conducted without notifying the Colmenareses. Moreover, the witnesses that were supposed to affirm the contents of the investigation reports were ambivalent and refused to validate the findings of the Bureau of Lands. For instance, Rodolfo Italia (Rodolfo), the DAR assistant team leader, stated that the DAR had not confirmed the survey made by the Bureau of Lands.^[23] Crisanto Babao (Crisanto), the Bureau of Lands' official sent to the subject property to investigate, also refused to affirm the findings of the survey because he did not participate therein.^[24] Lastly, the court found the report unreliable because it contained an observation that, upon inspection, the subject property appeared separate from Alipio's farmlot.

Given the finding that the subject property lies outside Alipio's farmlot, the court went on to determine if Raul, being Alipio's successor, had a right to the subject property as his homelot. The trial court held that Raul, not being an agricultural lessee of the Colmenareses, had no right to a homelot. The court explained that

Raul's unilateral installation as Alipio's successor was void because it violated the landowners' right to choose the successor as provided under Section 9 of the Code of Agrarian Reform.^[25]

The dispositive portion of the trial court ruling is as follows:

WHEREFORE, all of the foregoing considered, judgment is hereby rendered -

1. Declaring the lot in question - where Raul's house and battery and auto repair shop are located - not part of Alipio's farmlot;
2. Ordering the plaintiffs, particularly Raul, their agents and privies, to vacate the lot in question, to remove all the buildings and improvements they have constructed thereon, and to turn over the ownership and possession of said lot to the defendants, their heirs or successors;
3. Ordering the plaintiffs to pay the defendants the amount of P2,000.00 as attorney's fees;
4. Dismissing the claim of the plaintiffs for damages, attorney's fees and litigation expenses for lack of merit; and
5. Ordering the plaintiffs to pay the costs of the suit.

SO ORDERED.

Iloilo City, July 15, 1994.^[26]

Raul appealed the decision to the Court of Appeals (CA).

Ruling of the Court of Appeals^[27]

The appellate court noted that Raul merely rehashed all the arguments he had already presented to the trial court. The evidence presented by Raul before the trial court were not convincing, especially in light of the fact that Raul's witnesses themselves were reluctant to declare the subject property as part of Alipio's farmlot.

Since Raul did not prove that the subject property was part of his father's farmlot, the subject property remained part of Colmenareses' landholding. As landowner, Colmenares had the right to oust an intruder thereon; hence, the trial court's order for Raul to vacate the subject property was correct.

Raul moved for reconsideration^[28] where he admitted for the first time that, while the appeal was pending, he filed a petition for re-allocation of Alipio's farmholding with the DAR.^[29] The DAR granted his petition in an Order dated July 27, 2000, which decision had allegedly attained finality.^[30] The dispositive portion thereof states:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, ORDER is hereby issued:

1. GRANTING the herein petition for re-allocation filed by Raul Palomata. Consequently, Lot No. 2-B, with an area of 1.8698 hectares shall be awarded/allocated to him;
2. DIRECTING the Provincial Agrarian Reform Officer of Iloilo and Municipal Agrarian Reform Officer of Balasan, Iloilo to generate Emancipation Patent in favor of the new allocatee; and
3. DIRECTING the PARO and MARO concerned to strictly implement this Order.

SO ORDERED.^[31]

Raul did not state how this DAR Order affected the CA Decision. He only argued in his motion for reconsideration that, being an occupant of the subject property, he enjoyed the presumption of ownership. He also contended that, absent a contrary survey, the Bureau of Lands' survey should be respected.

The CA denied^[32] the motion for reconsideration. Hence, this petition.

Issues

Following are the issues raised by petitioner:

1. Whether the trial and appellate courts erred in the appreciation of facts when they ruled that the subject property is not included in the farmlot covered by CLT No. 10055;
2. Whether the trial and appellate courts erred in the appreciation of facts when they ruled that the subject property belongs to respondents;
3. Whether the trial and appellate courts erred in ordering the petitioner to vacate the subject property, remove the improvements thereon, and to return possession thereof to respondents.

Our Ruling

A factual review of the case is beyond the province of a Rule 45 petition. In seeking a review of the factual conclusions of the trial and appellate courts, petitioner Raul insists that the instant case falls under the exceptions because these conclusions are allegedly not supported by the evidence on record. Petitioner also contends that the two courts below misinterpreted facts that would materially affect the disposition of the case. Contrary to petitioner's arguments, the Court finds the conclusions of the two courts adequately supported by the evidence on record.

In their complaint, the Palomatas recognized the Colmenareses as the owners of the subject property, but the Palomatas claimed entitlement to the subject property by virtue of Alipio's CLT which awarded a farmlot to Alipio. But the said CLT did not indicate the metes and bounds of the awarded farmlot; it only stated that the