

THIRD DIVISION

[G.R. NO. 164947, January 31, 2006]

**SONIA MACEDA ALIAS SONIALITA MACEDA AND GEMMA
MACEDA-MACATANGAY, PETITIONERS, VS. ENCARNACION DE
GUZMAN VDA. DE MACATANGAY, RESPONDENT.**

D E C I S I O N

CARPIO MORALES, J.:

Petitioner Sonia Maceda (Sonia) and Bonifacio Macatangay (Macatangay) contracted marriage on July 26, 1964.^[1] The union bore one child, petitioner Gemma Macatangay (Gemma), on March 27, 1965.^[2]

The couple separated not long after the marriage.

In 1967, the couple executed a *Kasunduan*^[3] whereby they agreed to live separately.

Macatangay soon lived with Carmen Jaraza (Carmen).

After the death on December 7, 1998 of Macatangay who was a member of the Social Security System (SSS) or on December 14, 1998, his common-law wife Carmen filed a death benefit application before the SSS Lucena Branch. The SSS denied^[4] her application, it ruling that it is Macatangay's wife who is his primary beneficiary.

On January 9, 1999, petitioner Sonia filed before the SSS a death benefit application.

Macatangay's children with his common-law wife Carmen, namely Jay, Elena, and Joel, aged 27, 31, and 29 years old, respectively, also filed in 1999^[5] separate applications for death benefits following the SSS' denial of their mother's application.

On September 10, 1999, the SSS denied Macatangay's illegitimate children's claim on the ground that under Republic Act 8282, "THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT OF 1997," it is the dependent spouse, until he or she remarries, who is the primary beneficiary of the deceased member.^[6]

Petitioner Sonia's application for death benefit was approved on December 20, 1999. She received a lump sum amount of P33,000 representing "pensions" ^[7] from the SSS.

On February 22, 2000, Macatangay's mother, herein respondent Encarnacion de

Guzman, filed a petition before the Social Security Commission (SSC) in Makati City^[8] against herein petitioners Sonia and Gemma, for the grant to her of social security benefits, she claiming that her son designated her and his three illegitimate children as his beneficiaries under the SSS;^[9] she was made to sign a document regarding the distribution of benefits of Macatangay by SSS Lucena Branch Chief Atty. Corazon M. Villamayor who, however, did not furnish her a copy thereof nor inform her of its nature;^[10] and after she signed the document, the three illegitimate children received notices denying their application for death benefits.^[11]

The SSS office in Quezon City filed a petition-in-intervention in the petition filed by respondent before the SSC in Makati City.^[12]

In her position paper, respondent contended as follows:

[I]n the present case, the agreement of the spouses to live separately four (4) months after their marriage and which agreement was finally made in writing before the Barangay will unquestionably show that Sonia or Sonialita Maceda was **not dependent upon the late member for support** and therefore cannot be considered as his primary beneficiary under the aforesaid law. Said agreement, though proscribed by law by reasons of public policy, was a mutual agreement short of a court decree for legal separation and will not in any way change the fact that the two lived separately. This under any circumstances will dispute the presumption of the dependency for support arising from the legitimacy of the marital union as reasoned out by the SSS in their Petition for Intervention.^[13] (Emphasis and underscoring supplied)

Petitioners, on the other hand, hinged their claim on Section 8(e) and (k) of The Social Security Act of 1997. Thus they argued:

Section 8 (e) and (k) of Republic Act 8282 is crystal clear on who should be Bonifacio De Guzman Macatangay's beneficiary, thus:

(e) **Dependents** – The dependents shall be the following:

- (1) The legal spouse entitled by law to receive support from the member;
- (2) The legitimate, legitimated or legally adopted, and illegitimate child who is unmarried, not gainfully employed and has not reached twenty-one years (21) of age, or if over twenty-one (21) years of age, he is congenitally or while still a minor has been permanently incapacitated and incapable of self-support, physically or mentally, and
- (3) The parent who is receiving regular support from the member.

(k) **Beneficiaries** – The dependent spouse until he or she remarries, the dependent legitimate, legitimated or legally adopted, and illegitimate children, who shall be the primary beneficiaries of the member; Provided, That the dependent illegitimate children shall be entitled to fifty percent (50%) of the share of the legitimate, legitimated or legally adopted children: Provided, further, That in the absence of the dependent

legitimate, legitimated or legally adopted children of the member, his/her dependent illegitimate children shall be entitled to one hundred percent (100%) of the benefits. In their absence, the dependent parents who shall be the second beneficiaries of the member. In the absence of all the foregoing, any other person designated by the member as his/her secondary beneficiary. (Underscoring and emphasis in the original)^[14]

As for the SSS, it argued that:

[T]o be considered dependent for support, a surviving spouse of a member must only show that she is entitle[d] for support from the member by virtue of a **valid marriage**. The surviving spouse is **not required to show that he/she actually received support** from the member during his/her lifetime. Her dependency for support is actually presumed from the legitimacy of the marital union.^[15]-(Emphasis and underscoring supplied).

The SSC, taking the *Kasunduan*^[16] as proof that Sonia was no longer dependent for support on Bonifacio,^[17] and declaring that the SSS Lucena Branch acted in good faith in granting the benefits to Sonia, granted respondent's petition by Resolution of November 14, 2001.^[18] It accordingly disposed as follows:

IN VIEW OF ALL THE FOREGOING, the Commission hereby orders respondent Sonia (Sonialita) Macatangay to refund the monthly pensions paid to her by mistake and for the SSS to collect the same immediately upon receipt hereof.

Meanwhile, the System is ordered to grant the SS lump sum death benefits of member Bonifacio Macatangay to designated beneficiaries Encarnacion Macatangay, Elena, Joel, and Jay Macatangay, subject to existing rules and regulations.

SO ORDERED.^[19]-(Underscoring supplied).

Petitioners' motion for reconsideration^[20] of the SSC Resolution was denied by Order of August 14, 2002.^[21]

Petitioners thereupon filed a petition for review,^[22] docketed as CA G.R. No. 73038, before the Court of Appeals which dismissed it outright, by the present challenged Resolution of October 21, 2002,^[23] on the following procedural grounds:

A perusal of the petition however shows that there was no written explanation as to why respondents were not personally served copies of the petition as required under *Section 11, Rule 13 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure*.

Also, the petition is not accompanied by copies of the pleadings and documents relevant and pertinent thereto (i.e., position papers filed by the parties before the SSC, motion to dismiss filed by petitioner before the SSC) as required under *Section 6, Rule 43 of the 1997 Rules of Civil*

Procedure.

Finally, petitioner's counsel failed to comply with the requirements under Bar Matter No. 287 which requires that "all lawyers shall indicate in all pleadings, motions and papers signed and filed by them the number and date of their official receipt indicating payment of their annual membership dues to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines for the current year x x x." In the instant petition, Atty. Calayan failed to indicate the number and date of the official receipt evidencing payment of IBP dues.
[24]-(Italics in the original; underscoring supplied).

Via an Omnibus Motion, [25] petitioners prayed the Court of Appeals to (a) RECONSIDER its Resolution dated October 21, 2002 dismissing the Petition for Review; and (b) ADMIT the thereto attached certified true copies of the parties' Position Papers and the petitioners' Motion to Dismiss filed with the SSC, [26] the Certificate of Life Membership of their counsel Atty. Ronaldo Antonio Calayan, [27] and the Official Receipt showing said counsel's payment of lifetime membership fee to the Integrated Bar of the Philippines. [28]

The Court of Appeals, finding no substantial compliance by petitioners with the requirement in Section 11, Rule 13 of the 1997 Rules of Civil Procedure reading:

Section 11. Priorities in Modes of Service and Filing – Whenever practicable, the service and filing of pleadings and other papers shall be done personally. Except with respect to papers emanating from the court, a resort to other modes must be accompanied by a written explanation why the service or filing was not done personally. A violation of this rule may cause to consider the paper as not filed.,

denied the Omnibus Motion by Resolution of August 4, 2004. [29]

Hence, the present Petition for Review [30] faulting the appellate court as follows:

I. THE HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS ERRED IN STRICTLY ADHERING TO TECHNICALITIES, RATHER THAN IN SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE, IN THE APPLICATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF THE 1997 RULES ON CIVIL PROCEDURE.

II. THE CIRCUMSTANCES PREVAILING IN THIS PETITION FIND SUPPORT IN DECISIONS OF THIS HONORABLE COURT IN FAVOR OF THE REVERSAL OF THE COURT OF APPEALS' DECISION UNDER REVIEW. [31]
(Underscoring supplied).

Petitioners posit that they complied substantially with Section 11, Rule 13 of the Rules of Court, as follows:

Sonia's affidavit of service clearly shows the impracticability of personal service of copies of the petition to the adverse parties. Manifest in the same affidavit is the intervenor Social Security System's address in Quezon City; that of the private respondent's lawyer in Lopez, Quezon, and that of Social Security Commission in Makati City. Sonia's counsel's address is Lucena City. The distance between these addresses, it is most