

SECOND DIVISION

[G.R. No. 141283, August 30, 2001]

**SEGOVIA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, PETITIONER, VS. AND
J. L. DUMATOL REALTY AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION,
RESPONDENT.**

D E C I S I O N

BELLOSILLO, J.:

This is a Petition for Review on *Certiorari* under Rule 45 seeking the reversal and nullification of the Decision of the Court of Appeals^[1] and the reinstatement and affirmance *in toto* of the decision of the Office of the President, as well as the nullification and reversal of the Resolution of the appellate court which denied its Motion for Reconsideration.

Petitioner SEGOVIA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (SEGOVIA for brevity) and respondent J. L. DUMATOL REALTY AND DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (DUMATOL for brevity) are domestic corporations engaged in the business of real estate development.

On 2 March 1989 petitioner SEGOVIA and respondent DUMATOL entered into three (3) separate but identical contracts to sell involving three (3) condominium units, namely, Units Nos. 703, 704 and 904, of the Heart Tower Condominium located at Lot 5, Block 2, Valero Street, Salcedo Village, Makati City. The total contract price for the three (3) units was P6,050,000.00 under the following terms and conditions:

	<u>Unit 703</u>	<u>Unit 704</u>	<u>Unit 904</u>
Reservation Deposit	P 50,000.00	P 50,000.00	P 50,000.00
Downpayment	770,000.00	770,000.00	820,000.00
12 Monthly Installments Beginning 25 April 1989	90,000.00	90,000.00	90,000.00
Parking Lot	<u>100,000.00</u>	<u>100,000.00</u>	<u>100,000.00</u>
Total Contract Price	P2,000,000.00	P2,000,000.00	P2,050,000.00

The contracts, which were in standard form approved by the Housing and Land Use Regulatory Board (HLURB), contained the following provisions:

a. *Escalation Clause*

2.5 Should there be an increase or decrease in the total Consumer Price Index (CPI) (as set forth by the Central Bank of the Philippines or by any agency of the government), of more that FIFTEEN (15%) PERCENT, from the time this Contract is executed, a corresponding adjustment in the unpaid balance or remaining installment under this Contract shall be made. The amount of adjustment shall be the net percentage of change in excess of FIFTEEN (15%) PERCENT. The Buyer has the option to accelerate payments or pay the balance in full without interest to avoid upward adjustments.

b. *Cancellation by the Seller*

4.1 x x x x Where less than 2 years of installments were paid, the SELLER shall give the BUYER a grace period of 60 days but a penalty of 3% per month shall be levied upon unpaid installments. If the BUYER fails to comply, the SELLER may cancel the Contract after 30 days from receipt by the BUYER of the Notice of Cancellation or the Demand of Rescission of the Contract by a notarial act without need of judicial action.

Out of the total contract price of P6,050,000.00, respondent DUMATOL was able to pay only the amount of P4,500,000.00 for the three (3)units as follows:

Date of Payment	Mode of Payment	Amount Paid (In Pesos)
23 February 1989	PSB Check No. 242943	P 150,000.00
15 June 1989	PSB Check No. 257286	2,000,000.00
17 August 1989	PSB Check No. 318839	1,000,000.00
17 August 1989	PSB Check No. 337265	500,000.00
28 December 1989	PSB Check No. 396410	250,000.00
30 January 1990	PSB Check No. 396468	500,000.00
31 January 1990 (thru respondent's agent Julius Stracham	UDB Check No. 125417	<u>100,000.00</u>
	Total	P4,500,000.00

However, the check paid by respondent DUMATOL through Julius Stracham was dishonored by the bank so that only P4,400,000.00 was credited to the account of respondent DUMATOL.

Since respondent DUMATOL had been in default in updating its accounts, petitioner SEGOVIA sent on 5 November 1990 a *Notice of Rescission* officially notifying respondent that the contract to sell for Unit 904 was being rescinded.^[2]

On 15 November 1990 a meeting was held between the two (2) contracting parties whereby it was approved in principle that petitioner would withdraw the action for rescission subject to the condition that respondent would pay for the following: (a) the total balance for the three (3) condominium units, together with interest and the related charges amounting to P2,808,699.00, would be settled not later than 12:00 o'clock noon of 7 December 1990; and, (b) liquidated damages amounting to P700,000.00.^[3]

In its reply dated 23 November 1990 respondent DUMATOL disputed the computation made by petitioner and informed the latter that it was prepared to pay the remaining balance of the purchase price plus interests, which amounted to only P1,977,200.00.

In the meantime, in November 1990 respondent received from one Edilberto Bravo an offer to buy Units 703 and 704 at the price of P3,700,000.00 each. However, after being informed of petitioner's letter to respondent dated 16 November 1990, Mr. Bravo, fearful of being embroiled in the dispute, withdrew his offer.

On 29 November 1990 respondent DUMATOL lodged a complaint^[4] with the HLURB praying among others that the three percent (3%) interest rate being assessed by petitioner on the defaulted payments be declared erroneous and that petitioner be likewise ordered to pay P3,400,000.00 as compensatory damages.

On 4 December 1990, the settlement of the outstanding balance of the purchase price not having materialized, respondent received another notice of cancellation from petitioner, this time officially informing respondent that the *Contracts to Sell* for Units 703, 704 and 904 were being cancelled without need of judicial action.^[5]

On 5 December 1990 respondent consigned^[6] with the HLURB the amount of P1,977,220.00 in the form of Philippine Savings Bank Check No. 203331 which represented what it believed to be its remaining accountability to petitioner SEGOVIA.

On 24 May 1991, after due consideration of the respective position papers of the contending parties, the HLURB Arbiter rendered a judgment: (a) ordering DUMATOL to pay SEGOVIA the amount of P2,559,900.00 which represented the balance due on Units 703, 704 and 904 of the Heart Tower Condominium; (b) ordering DUMATOL to pay the outstanding association dues, utility bills and 1990 real estate taxes for the three (3) units; (c) ordering SEGOVIA to pay DUMATOL P2,746,773.05 as compensatory damages; and, (d) dismissing the case against SEGOVIA for lack of merit.^[7]

On appeal, the HLURB increased the account liability of respondent DUMATOL to P3,275,202.40 representing the principal balance, accrued interests and penalties as of 25 June 1991, as well as an additional three percent (3%) penalty per month for each delayed payment with six percent (6%) interest per annum beyond that date until fully paid. The Board likewise ordered respondent DUMATOL to pay petitioner SEGOVIA P30,000.00 as attorney's fees.^[8]

Not satisfied with the decision, both parties elevated the controversy to the Office of

the President which dismissed the appeal of respondent but partly gave due course to that of petitioner. In its judgment, the Office of the President modified the decision of the HLURB by ordering respondent DUMATOL: (a) to pay petitioner SEGOVIA the amount of P3,275,487.56, instead of P3,275,202.40, representing the principal balance, accrued interests and penalties as of 25 June 1991, as well as an additional three percent (3%) per month for each delayed payment, with six percent (6%) interest per annum beyond that date until fully paid; and, (b) to pay fifty percent (50%) of the amount of P3,126,372.11 as contract price adjustment, with six percent (6%) interest per annum from 15 November 1990 until fully paid.

On 12 January 1999 respondent DUMATOL filed before the Court of Appeals a petition seeking to annul and set aside the decision of the Office of the President. In its appeal, respondent prayed that the decision of 24 May 1991 rendered by the HLURB Arbiter in the proceeding below be reinstated. Respondent argued that the three percent (3%) penalty charge was iniquitous and unconscionable and therefore unjustified; that its acts of tendering and consigning the sum of P1,977,200.00 with the HLURB suspended the running of such interest charges; that its constitutional right to due process was violated by the Office of President when it adopted the computation submitted by petitioner on appeal to the HLURB Commissioners; and, that there was no basis for the imposition of the six percent (6%) interest per annum.

The Court of Appeals granted the petition and nullified the decision rendered by the Office of the President. It opined that respondent's act of consigning to the HLURB the amount of P1,977,200.00 by way of check after tender of payment was refused by petitioner amounted to substantial compliance with the requirements of a valid consignment. Although the appellate court deemed it pointless to pass upon the propriety of imposing the penalty charge, nonetheless, it noted that under the circumstances of the case the three percent (3%) penalty charge was indeed iniquitous and unconscionable. According to the Court of Appeals^[9] -

x x x it bears considering that the petitioner (respondent herein) stands to lose all three condominium units, notwithstanding the fact that the total payments made by it in the amount of P4,400,000.00 would have been enough to pay for two (2) condominium units x x x x Petitioner (herein respondent) may lose all three units because of the unconscionable penalty charges, which are evidently disproportionate to the principal obligation.

On the matter of the additional six percent (6%) per annum as damages, the court *a quo* held that there was no legal basis for its imposition. The record shows that this matter was raised for the first time on appeal as a claim for the twelve percent (12%) interest which was subsequently reduced by the HLURB Commissioners to six percent (6%) per annum.

The pivotal issue to be resolved is whether the Decision of the Court of Appeals which set aside the decision of the Office of the President and reinstated that of the HLURB is sufficiently supported by law and the facts of the case.

To give finality to the main issue, we have to resolve certain equally contentious points which have bewildered the parties at the very outset, specifically: (a)

whether the computation of respondent's unpaid obligation to petitioner by the Office of the President is correct; (b) whether there is valid consignment of payment by respondent which therefore justified the suspension of the imposition of the three percent (3%) penalty interest provided under the contract; (c) whether petitioner is entitled to the six percent (6%) interest per annum as damages; (d) whether petitioner is liable to pay respondent compensatory damages for unrealized profits; (e) whether petitioner is entitled to the fifty percent (50%) contract price adjustment; and, (f) whether petitioner is entitled to recover attorney's fees.

For clarity, we shall proceed with the first issue by setting forth certain established facts, namely: (a) that the contract price for the three (3) condominium units purchased by respondent is P6,050,000.00; and, (b) under each contract to sell respondent (buyer) committed to pay P90,000.00 for each unit or a total of P270,000.00 for twelve (12) months for the three (3) units, beginning 25 April 1989. Simply stated, by 25 March 1990, respondent-buyer should have already completed the payment of the three (3) condominium units otherwise the unpaid installments would be subject to a penalty of three percent (3%) interest; and, (c) respondent-buyer had not paid its account balance and had been in arrears from month to month.

We observe that the contending realty firms, and even the tribunals below, are not in agreement as to the liability of respondent DUMATOL. In its decision, the HLURB Arbiter ordered respondent to pay petitioner the sum of P2,559,900.00 representing the balance on the units subject of the contracts to sell. The HLURB however noted that the computation made by the HLURB Arbiter should have taken into consideration the date when the contract was executed, the installments due, the penalties and interests, the payments made and the application of payments. The Office of the President, for its part, claimed that respondent incurred arrearages as of 25 June 1991 in the amount of P3,275,487.56. This last computation was adopted by the Court of Appeals in its assailed Decision.

Petitioner now assails before us the Arbiter's determination of respondent's account balance for being erroneous. Petitioner contends that the computation showed nineteen (19) monthly installments of P270,000.00 instead of the agreed twelve (12) months of P270,000.00 for the three (3) units. Further, petitioner points out that the HLURB Arbiter erroneously considered the downpayment for the three (3) units in the amount of P2,360,000.00 as part of the unpaid balance, contrary to the explicit and express provisions of the contracts to sell.

On the other hand, respondent begrudges the adoption by the Office of the President and the HLURB Commissioners of a computation entirely based on the computation made by petitioner which, according to respondent, is violative of its right to due process for it deprives respondent of the opportunity to contest the document, to cross-examine the person who prepared it, and to present countervailing evidence.

Given the inconsistent and contradictory claims by the contending parties, exacerbated by the discrepant figures of the courts below, it is imperative that a more accurate determination of respondent's accountability be made by a lower body in order to settle the question with finality.

On the second issue, it is crucial to rule upon the validity of respondent's