

FIRST DIVISION

[G.R. No. 120961, October 02, 1997]

**DISTILLERIA WASHINGTON, INC. OR WASHINGTON
DISTILLERY, INC., PETITIONER VS LA TONDEÑA DISTILLERS,
INC. AND THE HONORABLE COURT OF APPEALS, RESPONDENTS.
R E S O L U T I O N**

KAPUNAN, J.:

On October 17, 1996, this court rendered a decision in the above-entitled case, the dispositive portion of which reads, as follows:

WHEREFORE, the decision of the appellate court is MODIFIED by ordering LTDI to pay petitioner just compensation for the seized bottles. Instead, however, of remanding the case to the Court of Appeals to receive evidence on, and thereafter resolve, the assessment thereof, this Court accepts and accordingly adopts the quantification of P18,157.00 made the the trial court. No costs.

With the deanial of the Motion for Reconsideration ,petitioner sought a second reconsideration with leave of court of our decision raising new issues, to wit:

1.01.d. The Supreme Court, in its Decision of October 17, 1996, modified the decision of the Court of Appeals. It held that ownership of the bottles has passed to the consumer, ultimately, to Washington Distillery, Inc., thereby upholding the finding of the Regional Trial Court and reversing the ruling or the Court of Appeals; nonetheless, while ruling that the ownership over the bottles had passed to Washington Distillery, Inc.,it held that Washington Distillery, Inc. may not use the bottles because of the 'trademark protection to the registrant' (La Tondeña Distillers, Inc.). Instead of directing the return to the bottles to Washington Distillery, Inc., the Court ordered La Tondeña Distillers, Inc. to pay Washington Distillery, Inc. the amount of P18,157.00.

2.00. The decision of the Supreme Court itself therefore raises new issues. As owner of the bottles, should not Washington Distillery, Inc. be given possession of the bottles? Would its use of the bottles violate the 'trademark protection of the registrant,' La Tondeña Distillers, Inc. afforded by R.A. 623, as amended?

3.00. The 'Motion for Reconsideration' of the petitioner Washington Distillery, Inc. is addressed to these new issues. They had not been previously addressed by the parties. They could not have been previously

passed upon. It could hardly be said 'that no substantial argument,' not previously raised, is made in the 'Motion for Reconsideration' to warrant a modification of the Court's decision.

On May 21, 1997, the Court resolved to set for hearing the motion for reconsideration on May 28, 1997 for its judicious disposition. Thereafter, the parties as required by the Court filed their simultaneous memoranda "to expound and lay particular emphasis on the provision of Section 5 of R.A. 623 which proscribes the filing of an action against any person to whom registered manufacturer, bottler or seller has transferred by way of sale, any to the containers." The parties complied.

A reexamination of the arguments raised by petitioner in its Second Motion for Reconsideration filed on February 13, 1997, in the hearing on May 28, 1997 and in the subsequent memorandum filed thereafter, convinces us the merits of its position.

To recall, La Tondeña Distillers, Inc. (La Tondeña, for short) filed before the Regional Trial Court for the recovery, under its claim of ownership, of possession or replevin against Distilleria Washington, Inc. or Washington Distillery, Inc. (Distilleria Washington) of 18,157 empty "350 c.c. white flint bottles" bearing the blown-in marks of "La Tondeña Inc." and "Ginebra San Miguel," averring that Distilleria Washington was using the bottles for its own "Gin Seven" products without the consent of Distilleria Washington in violation of Republic Act 623.

The trial court in its decision dismissed the complaint, upholding Distilleria Washington's contention that a purchaser of liquor pays only a single price for the liquor and the bottle and is not required to return the bottle at any time.

The Court of Appeals reversed the trial court's decision, ruling that under Republic Act 623, the use of marked bottles by any person other than the manufacturer, bottler or seller, without the latter's written consent, is unlawful. It emphasized that the marks of La Tondeña's ownership stamped or blown-in to the bottles are sufficient notice to the public that the bottles are La Tondeña's property; hence, Distilleria Washington cannot be considered a purchaser on good faith.

While our decision of October 17, 1996 affirmed with modification the Court of Appeals' decision, we at least implicitly acknowledge that there was a valid transfer of the bottles to Distilleria Washington, except that its possession of the bottles without the written consent of La Tondeña gives rise to a prima facie presumption of illegal use under R.A. 623.

In seeking reconsideration of the decision of this Court, petitioner advances, among others, the following arguments:

(1) If, as the Court found in its decision of October 17, 1996, Distilleria Washington had acquired ownership of the bottles, La Tondeña's suit for replevin, where the sole issue is possession, should be denied.

(2) Since the right of ownership over the bottles gives rise, according to

the Court's own language, to its own elements of *jus possidendi*, *jus utendi*, *jus fruendi*, *jus disponendi*, and *jus abutendi*, along with the applicable *jus lex*, to allow La Tondeña to keep the bottles is to deny Distilleria Washington, the very attributes or elements of its ownership.

(3) There is no showing--and it cannot be assumed--that if Distilleria Washington would have possession of the bottles, it will exercise the other attributes of ownership, along with the applicable *jus lex*, over the "marks of ownership stamped or marked" on the bottles.

(4) The provision in Sec. 3 of Republic Act 623 to the effect that the use by any person other than the registered manufacturer, bottler or seller without the written permission of the latter of any such bottle, etc. shall give rise to a *prima facie* presumption that such use or possession is unlawful, does not arise in the instant case because the Court has itself found Section 5 of the same law applicable.

Additionally, petitioner argues with persuasion the following points in its memorandum:

(5) It is absurd to hold the buyer such as Distilleria Washington, liable for the possession and use of its own bottles without the written consent of La Tondeña who is no longer the owner thereof and for which it has received payment in full.

(6) To hold the buyer liable under Sections 2 and 3 would grant La Tondeña the extraordinary right not only of possession and use of the bottles which it has sold and no longer owns, but also to sell said bottles *ad infinitum*, thus enriching itself unjustly.

(7) It is manifestly unjust and unconscionable that millions of buyers of Ginebra San Miguel, who pay not only for gin but also for the bottles containing it should run the risk of criminal prosecution by the mere fact of possession of the empty bottles after consuming the liquor.

Distilleria Washington's motion raises the novel issue that if, as we ruled in our decision of October 17, 1996, petitioner became the owner over the bottles seized from it by replevin, then it has the right to their possession and use as attributes of ownership, unless their use violates the trademark or incorporeal rights accorded private respondent by R.A 623 which has not really been established in this case.

As pointed out in our decision,

Parenthetically, petitioner is not here being charged with violation of Sec. 2 of R.A. 623 or the Trademark Law. The instant case is one for replevin (manual delivery) where the claimant must be able to show convincingly that he is either the owner or clearly entitled to the possession of the object sought to be recovered. Replevin is a possessory action. The gist of which focuses on the right of possession that in turn, is dependent on

a legal basis that, not infrequently, looks to the ownership of the object sought to be replevied.”

Since replevin as a possessory action is dependent upon ownership, it is relevant to ask: Did La Tondeña Distillers, Inc. transfer ownership of its marked bottles or containers when it sold its products in the market? Were the marked bottles or containers part of the products sold to the public?

In our decision sought to be reconsidered, we categorically answered the question in the affirmative in this wise:

R.A. No. 623 does not disallow the sale or transfer of ownership of the marked bottles or containers. In fact, the contrary is implicit in the law thus:

SEC. 5. x x x.

SEC. 6. x x x

Scarcely disputed are certain and specific industry practices in the sale of gin. The manufacturer sells the product in marked containers, through dealers, to the public in supermarkets, grocery shops, retail stores and other sales outlets. The buyer takes the item; he is neither required to return the bottle nor required to make a deposit to assure its return to the seller. He could return the bottle and get a refund. A number of bottles at times find their way to commercial users. It cannot be gainsaid that ownership of the containers does pass on the consumer albeit subject to the statutory limitations on the use of the registered containers and to the trademark rights of the registrant. The statement in Section 5 of R.A. 623 to the effect that the ‘sale of beverage contained the said containers shall not include the sale of the containers unless specifically so provided’ is not a rule of proscription. It is a rule of construction that, in keeping with the spirit and intent of the law, establishes at best a presumption (of non-conveyance of the container) and which by no means can be taken to be either interdictive or conclusive in character. Upon the other hand, LTDI’s sales invoice, stipulating that the ‘sale does not include the bottles with the blown-in marks of ownership of La Tondeña Distillers,’ cannot affect those who are not privies thereto.

In plain terms, therefore, La Tondeña not only sold its gin products but also the marked bottles or containers, as well. And when these products were transferred by way of sale, then ownership over the bottles and all its attributes (jus utendi, jus abutendi, just fruendi, jus disponendi) passed to the buyer. It necessarily follows that the transferee has the right to possession of the bottles unless he uses them in violation of the original owner’s registered or incorporeal rights.

After practically saying that La Tondeña has surrendered ownership and