

## SECOND DIVISION

**[ G.R. No. 148541, November 11, 2004 ]**

**DEVELOPMENT BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES, PETITIONER, VS.  
BONITA O. PEREZ AND ALFREDO PEREZ, RESPONDENTS.**

### DECISION

**CALLEJO, SR., J.:**

This is a petition for review on certiorari seeking to reverse and set aside the Decision<sup>[1]</sup> of the Court of Appeals (CA) dated February 28, 2001, and to reinstate the Decision of the Regional Trial Court (RTC), Makati City, Branch 145, in Civil Case No. 12057, as modified by trial court's Order dated June 11, 1993.

#### The Antecedents

On April 28, 1978, petitioner Development Bank of the Philippines (DBP) sent a letter to respondent Bonita Perez, informing the latter of the approval of an industrial loan amounting to P214,000.00 for the acquisition of machinery and equipment and for working capital, and an additional industrial loan amounting to P21,000.00 to cover unforeseen price escalation.<sup>[2]</sup>

On May 18, 1978, the respondents were made to sign four promissory notes covering the total amount of the loan, P235,000.00. Three promissory notes for P24,000.00, P48,000.00, and P142,000.00, respectively, were executed, totaling P214,000.00. These promissory notes were all due on August 31, 1988.<sup>[3]</sup> A fourth promissory note due on September 19, 1988 was, likewise, executed to cover the additional loan of P21,000.00.<sup>[4]</sup> The promissory notes were to be paid in equal quarterly amortizations and were secured by a mortgage contract covering real and personal properties.<sup>[5]</sup>

On September 6, 1978, the petitioner sent a letter<sup>[6]</sup> to the respondents informing them of the terms for the payment of the P214,000.00 industrial loan. On November 8, 1978, the petitioner sent another letter<sup>[7]</sup> to the respondents informing them about the terms and conditions of their additional P21,000.00 industrial loan.

Due to the respondents' failure to comply with their amortization payments, the petitioner decided to foreclose the mortgages that secured the obligation. However, in a Letter<sup>[8]</sup> dated October 7, 1981, Mrs. Perez requested for a restructuring of their account due to difficulties they were encountering in collecting receivables.

On April 1, 1982, the petitioner informed the respondents that it had approved the restructuring of their accounts.<sup>[9]</sup> The loan was restructured, and on May 6, 1982, the respondents signed another promissory note in the amount of P231,000.00 at

eighteen percent (18%) interest per annum, payable quarterly at P12,553.27, over a period of ten years. The promissory note stated in part:

#### PROMISSORY NOTE

P231,000.00

Makati, Metro Manila, May 6, 1982

On or before May 7, 1992, for value received, I/we, jointly and severally, promise to pay the DEVELOPMENT BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES, or order at its office at Makati, Metro Manila, Philippines, the sum of TWO HUNDRED THIRTY-ONE THOUSAND PESOS (P231,000.00), Philippine Currency, with interest at the rate of EIGHTEEN per centum (18%) per annum. Before the date of maturity, we hereby bind ourselves to make partial payments, the first payment to be made on August 7, 1982 and the subsequent payments on the 7<sup>th</sup> day of every three (3) months thereafter, and each of all such payments shall be TWELVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED FIFTY-THREE and 27/100 PESOS (P12,553.27) which shall cover amortizations on the principal and interest at the above-mentioned rate.

This loan shall be subject to penalty charges and additional interest as follows:

On loan with amortizations  
or portions thereof in  
arrears irrespective of age.

Additional interest at the basic  
loan interest rate per annum  
computed on total amortizations  
past due irrespective of age.

P L U S

Penalty charge of 8% per annum  
computed on total amortizations  
in arrears irrespective of age.

The DBP further reserves the right to increase, with notice to the mortgagor, the rate of interest on the loan as well as all other fees and charges on loans and advances pursuant to such policy as it may adopt from time to time during the period of the loan; Provided that the rate of interest on the loan shall be reduced in the event that the applicable maximum rate of interest is reduced by law or by the Monetary Board; Provided, further, that the adjustment in the rate of interest shall take effect on or after the effectivity of the increase or decrease in the maximum rate of interest.

In case of non-payment of the amount of this note or any portion of it on demand, when due, or any other amount or amounts due on account of this note, the entire obligation shall become due and demandable, and if, for the enforcement of the payment thereof, the DEVELOPMENT BANK OF

THE PHILIPPINES, is constrained to entrust the case to its attorneys, I/we, jointly and severally, bind myself/ourselves to pay for attorney's fees, as provided for in the mortgage contract, in addition to the legal fees and other incidental expenses. In the event of foreclosure of the mortgage securing this note, I/we further bind myself/ourselves, jointly and severally, to pay the deficiency , if any.

SIGNED IN THE PRESENCE OF:

illegible  
illegible

SGD.  
BONITA ANG  
ORDIALES

SGD.  
ALFREDO PEREZ

(Bonita O.  
Perez)

This Promissory Note supersedes the Promissory Note dated May 18, 1978 and stands secured by a mortgage contract executed by the above parties on the same date, subject to the following terms and conditions.

[10]

As stated in the promissory note, the first amortization was due on August 7, 1982, and the succeeding amortizations, every quarter thereafter. However, the respondents made their first payment amounting to P15,000.00<sup>[11]</sup> only on April 20, 1983 or after the lapse of three quarters.<sup>[12]</sup> Their second payment, which should have been paid on November 7, 1982, was made on December 2, 1983 and only in the amount of P5,000.00. The third payment was then made at the time when the ninth quarterly amortization should have been paid. After this, the respondents completely stopped paying.<sup>[13]</sup> The total payments they made after the restructure of the loan amounted to P35,000.00 only.<sup>[14]</sup>

This failure to meet the quarterly amortization of the loan prompted the petitioner to institute foreclosure proceedings on the mortgages. The sale of the properties covered by the mortgage contract was scheduled on October 30, 1985.<sup>[15]</sup>

On October 24, 1985, the respondents filed a Complaint<sup>[16]</sup> for the nullification of the new promissory note with damages and preliminary prohibitory injunction. The complaint alleged that the petitioner restructured the respondents' obligation in bad faith by requiring them to sign another promissory note for P231,000.00 without considering the total payments made on the loan amounting to P224,383.43. The respondents claimed that the petitioner failed to explain to them how it had arrived at the amount of the restructured loan. The respondents also alleged that the petitioner failed to furnish them with a disclosure statement as required by Rep. Act No. 3765, also known as the Truth in Lending Act, prior to the consummation of the transaction. They averred that the interest imposed on the said transaction was usurious. They, likewise, alleged that the new promissory note constituted a novation of the previous obligations.

In its answer, the petitioner denied the allegations and averred that the claim for violation of the disclosure requirement under Rep. Act No. 3765 was not within the jurisdiction of the RTC and was barred by prescription. By way of compulsory counterclaim, the petitioner prayed that the respondents be ordered to pay their

obligation, plus exemplary damages and costs.<sup>[17]</sup> During trial, the petitioner presented a Statement of Account dated September 14, 1990, showing that the total amount of the obligation as of September 15, 1990 was P1,384,465.71.<sup>[18]</sup>

On October 25, 1985, the trial court ordered the petitioner to desist from holding the public auction of the respondents' properties. The trial court issued an Order on April 25, 1986 to maintain the status *quo*.

In its Decision dated May 10, 1993, the court *a quo* upheld the validity of the new promissory note and ordered the respondents to pay their obligation. The dispositive portion reads:

WHEREFORE, judgment is rendered dismissing the complaint for failure of plaintiffs to prove their causes of action by clear preponderance of evidence, with costs against them.

The order issued on April 25, 1986, ordering the defendant Bank to maintain the status *quo* and suspending the auction sale, is hereby set aside.

Defendant Bank's counterclaim is hereby granted, and plaintiffs are hereby ordered to pay the former the sum of One Million Three Hundred Eighty-four Thousand Four Hundred Sixty-five Pesos and Seventy-one Centavos (P1,384,465.71), representing the latter's obligation as of September 15, 1990, with interest thereon at the legal rate of twelve (12%) percent per annum pursuant to Sec. 2 of CB Circular No. 905; (Sagrador vs. Valderrama, *supra*), from September 15, 1990 up to full payment of said sum. The other counterclaim for exemplary damages is hereby dismissed.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[19]</sup>

Upon the petitioner's motion for reconsideration, the trial court issued an order<sup>[20]</sup> amending the dispositive portion of its decision by changing the rate of interest to eighteen percent (18%) per annum.

Dissatisfied, the respondents appealed to the CA. On February 28, 2001, the CA rendered a decision, the dispositive portion of which reads:

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Decision dated May 10, 1993, docketed as Civil Case No. 12057 by the Regional Trial Court of Makati, Branch 145, is hereby MODIFIED in the sense that the amount of P1,384,465.71 as of September 1990 is SET ASIDE and the formula mandated by Central Bank Circular No. 158 should be applied by the trial court in computing the total obligation and liability of appellants. All the other parts of the assailed decision are AFFIRMED *in toto*.

SO ORDERED.<sup>[21]</sup>

The CA found that the respondents did not voluntarily sign the restructured promissory note as they were only forced to sign it for fear of having their mortgaged property foreclosed by the bank. It ruled that the restructured

promissory note which was prepared by the petitioner alone was a contract of adhesion which violates the rule on mutuality of contracts.

Nonetheless, the CA held that the trial court should have used the formula prescribed by paragraph 3,<sup>[22]</sup> Sec. 2(i), Central Bank (CB) Circular No. 158, Rules and Regulations Implementing Rep. Act No. 3765, in computing the total obligation of the respondents considering that Sec. 3(a) thereof provides that it applies to any loans, mortgages, deeds of trust, advances and discounts.<sup>[23]</sup> The CA also held that since the loan is secured by a mortgage contract, the eighteen percent (18%) interest rate was excessive and usurious under CB Circular No. 817. According to the appellate court, CB Circular No. 905, series of 1982, simply suspended the effectivity of the Usury Law; it did not authorize either party to unilaterally raise the interest without the other party's consent.<sup>[24]</sup> Finally, the CA concluded that there was neither basis nor explanation as to how the measly amount of P214,000.00 in 1972, restructured to P231,000.00 in 1982, ballooned to P1,384,465.71 as of September 15, 1990.<sup>[25]</sup>

Both parties moved to reconsider the said decision. The CA denied the said motions in a Resolution dated May 31, 2001.

### **The Present Petition**

The petitioner raises the following grounds in the instant petition:

1. Whether or not the Honorable Court of Appeals had decided this instant case in a way not in accord with the spirit and intent of Republic Act No. 3765, otherwise known as the Truth in Lending Act, when it declared that "the trial court should have applied the formula provided by Central Bank Circular No. 158, series of 1963, as provided above to arrive at the total obligations of appellants less the amounts paid by appellants as evidenced by the vouchers and receipts attached to the records;"
2. Whether or not the conclusion of the Honorable Court of Appeals stating that the private respondents did not voluntarily sign the restructured promissory note is entirely grounded on speculations and/or surmises or conjectures;
3. Whether or not the Honorable Court of Appeals failed to notice certain relevant facts which if it had been considered would change its finding that the restructured promissory note was prepared by the appellee Bank alone;
4. Whether or not the Honorable Court of Appeals failed to notice certain relevant facts which if it had been considered would change its finding that the amount of P1,384,465.71 as of September 15, 1990 has neither basis at all nor any explanation how this amount came to existence;
5. Whether or not the conclusion of the Honorable Court of Appeals stating that petitioner DBP failed to follow Central Bank Circular No.