

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 158384, June 12, 2008]

**JUAN OLIVARES AND DOLORES ROBLES, PETITIONERS, VS.
ESPERANZA DE LA CRUZ SARMIENTO, RESPONDENT.**

D E C I S I O N

CARPIO, J.:

The Case

This is a petition for review^[1] of the Decision^[2] dated 30 October 2002 and the Resolution dated 8 May 2003 of the Court of Appeals in CA-G.R. CV No. 48949. The Court of Appeals reversed the Decision dated 1 March 1993 of the Regional Trial Court of Iloilo, Branch 36.

The Facts

Respondent Esperanza de la Cruz Sarmiento (respondent) was the owner of a 230-square meter parcel of residential land located at Barangay San Antonio, Oton, Iloilo, covered by TCT No. T-86397. On 18 August 1976, respondent and her husband Manuel Sarmiento (Manuel) obtained a P12,000 loan from the Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) for the construction of a residential house on the land. Respondent mortgaged the land to DBP as security for the payment of the loan. Respondent and Manuel failed to pay the monthly amortizations on the loan. In 1979, respondent allegedly obtained a loan of P35,000 from Luis Boteros (Boteros) so she could pay her obligation with the DBP and to prevent the foreclosure of the mortgaged land. Boteros was respondent's neighbor and the godfather of her eldest son. Respondent alleged that instead of getting the amount she loaned from Boteros, she authorized Boteros and his niece Segunda Planta (Planta) to pay her loan with the DBP. Respondent accused Boteros and Planta of forging her signatures in two deeds of sale, making it appear that respondent and her husband Manuel sold the land and the house (property) constructed thereon to Boteros.

Boteros, on the other hand, alleged that in 1979, respondent offered to sell the property to him, provided Boteros would pay respondent's loan with the DBP plus the interest due thereon. Boteros accepted the offer and paid respondent's loan plus interest with the DBP, totaling P21,009.62.^[3] Boteros made a final payment of the loan on 26 June 1979 and the DBP thereafter issued a certification of cancellation of mortgage^[4] dated 28 June 1979. Meanwhile, the agreement between Boteros and respondent was put in writing through a notarized Deed of Definite Sale^[5] dated May 1979, signed by both respondent and Boteros. Under the terms of the Deed of Definite Sale, respondent sold the property to Boteros for P2,000 in cash, with the condition that Boteros will assume respondent's P12,000 loan from the DBP, together with the interest due thereon. After Boteros fully paid respondent's loan

with the DBP, respondent and Boteros executed another document, a Deed of Absolute Sale dated 2 July 1979, stating that spouses respondent and Manuel were selling the property to Boteros for P25,000. The Deed of Absolute Sale was signed by both respondent and her husband Manuel. On 24 July 1979, the Register of Deeds cancelled TCT No. T-86397 and issued a new title, TCT No. T-99121 in the name of Boteros. On 7 January 1984, Boteros sold the property to spouses Juan Olivares (Olivares) and Dolores Robles (Robles) for P27,000.^[6] Boteros alleged that respondent was aware of the sale of the property to Olivares and Robles (petitioners) since respondent was among those who looked for interested buyers of the property.

Olivares testified that before buying the property from Boteros, he approached respondent who confirmed to him that she already sold the property to Boteros. On 7 January 1984, petitioners bought the property from Boteros. On 3 April 1985, the Register of Deeds cancelled TCT No. T-99121 and issued a new title, TCT No. T-115,672 in petitioners' name. After the title was transferred to petitioners' name, Olivares demanded that respondent vacate the property. Respondent allegedly requested that she be given some time to find a place where her family could transfer. Petitioners eventually filed with the Municipal Trial Court of Oton an illegal detainer case^[7] against respondent and Manuel when they continued to stay on the property despite repeated demands from petitioners for them to vacate the property. On 14 October 1988, the Municipal Trial Court rendered a decision^[8] in the illegal detainer case and ordered respondent and Manuel to vacate the property and deliver the possession thereof to petitioners.

Meanwhile, on 7 December 1984, respondent filed a civil case for recovery of possession, ownership, annulment of title, and damages against Boteros and Planta, which was docketed as Civil Case No. 16177. On 23 April 1986, Civil Case No. 16177 was dismissed without prejudice.

On 26 September 1986, respondent filed with the Regional Trial Court of Iloilo a complaint^[9] for recovery of ownership, annulment of title, and damages against Boteros, Planta, and petitioners, which was docketed as Civil Case No. 17242.

On 1 March 1993, the Regional Trial Court of Iloilo, Branch 36 rendered a decision, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, viewed from the foregoing considerations, judgment is hereby rendered DISMISSING the complaint and ordering the plaintiff [Esperanza de la Cruz Sarmiento] to pay herein defendants [Luis Boteros, Segunda Planta, Juan Olivares, and Dolores Robles]:

1. The amount of P3,000.00 for moral damages;
2. The amount of P5,000.00 for attorney's fees; and
3. The amount of P2,000.00 as litigation expenses.

SO ORDERED.^[10]

On appeal, the Court of Appeals rendered its Decision dated 30 October 2002, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, the appealed judgment is hereby REVERSED and SET ASIDE and a new one entered declaring the following deeds of sale as NULL and VOID:

(a) Deed of Definite Sale from Esperanza de la Cruz to Luis Boteros, dated May 1979;

(b) Deed of Absolute Sale from Manuel Sarmiento and Esperanza de la Cruz to Luis Boteros, dated July 2, 1979, and

(c) Definite Sale from Luis Boteros to Juan Olivares and Dolores Robles dated January 7, 1984.

The plaintiff-appellant [Esperanza de la Cruz] shall be restored in possession of the subject property.

However, the plaintiff-appellant is ordered to pay defendants-appellees Juan and Dolores within thirty (30) days from the finality of this Decision the following:

1. P21,009.62, the amount paid by defendant-appellee Luis to DBP.
2. Interest thereon at the legal rate computed from the date of the subject transaction up to the time that the plaintiff-appellant was ejected from the said property in 1989, and
3. The costs.

In case of default on the part of the plaintiff-appellant to settle her obligation within the period herein set forth, the property shall be sold at public auction and the proceeds applied to the mortgage debts and the costs.

SO ORDERED.^[11]

Petitioners moved for reconsideration, which the Court of Appeals denied for lack of merit.

Hence, this petition for review.

The Ruling of the Trial Court

The trial court upheld the validity and genuineness of the Deed of Absolute Sale executed by respondent in favor of Boteros, who subsequently sold it to petitioners. The trial court held that respondent's mere denial of entering into a contract of sale with Boteros, which was not corroborated by any other evidence, cannot be given evidentiary weight against the notarized deed of sale.

On the validity of the Deed of Absolute Sale, the trial court ruled:

The validity of the Deed of Sale in favor of the defendant [Boteros] must likewise be upheld, since all the requisites for a valid contract were present, namely, consent, object certain and consideration. Consent is

evident from the signature of the defendant on the document (which signature was confirmed to be genuine by the National Bureau of Investigation) made in the presence of two witnesses and before Notary Public Manuel C. Roa, (Exhibit "9" and "9-A" for the defendant). The object of the contract is likewise certain, that is lot No. 2328-B covered by TCT No. T-86397. The cause or consideration is also duly established, that is, for the sum of P25,000.00.^[12]

The Ruling of the Court of Appeals

The Court of Appeals held that the transaction between respondent and Boteros was not a contract of sale but merely an equitable mortgage. The Court of Appeals ruled that the P25,000 consideration indicated on the Deed of Absolute Sale dated 2 July 1979 was unusually inadequate for the sale of the property.

Considering that respondent's educational level was only grade 3 and she could not understand English, the Court of Appeals held that the contents of the deed of sale should have been fully explained to respondent, in accordance with Article 1332^[13] of the Civil Code. Because Boteros failed to explain the contents of the deed of sale, respondent could not have fully understood the import and consequence of her signing the deed of sale.

The Court of Appeals further noted that respondent and her family stayed on the property even after the alleged sale to Boteros, which under Article 1602 of the Civil Code is one of the cases where a contract can be presumed to be an equitable mortgage.

Since the contract is merely an equitable mortgage and not an absolute sale, the Court of Appeals ruled that respondent can still recover the property from petitioners who were not buyers in good faith. The Court of Appeals noted that petitioners, who were neighbors of respondent, were aware that respondent still occupied the property. Thus, petitioners should have made inquiries before buying the property from Boteros. Since Boteros was not the owner of the property, he had no right to sell the property to petitioners.

The Issues

Petitioners raise the following issues:

1. WHETHER THE APPELLATE COURT CAN DISREGARD THE FACTS ESTABLISHED BY THE TRIAL COURT BY UPHOLDING THE UNCORROBORATED TESTIMONY/DENIAL OF THE RESPONDENT OVER AND ABOVE THE AFFIRMATIVE TESTIMONIES OF WITNESSES AND NOTARY PUBLIC.
2. WHETHER THE FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCLUSION REACHED BY THE APPELLATE COURT WERE ENTIRELY GROUNDED ON SPECULATION, WITHOUT CITATION OF THE SPECIFIC EVIDENCE ON WHICH THEY ARE BASED.
3. WHETHER THE SUBJECT DEED OF DEFINITE SALE CAN BE CONSTRUED AS AN EQUITABLE MORTGAGE, AND THEREAFTER BE