

ANG mga error at omisyon sa Classified Ads ng PEOPLE'S BALITA ay dapat ipabata sa amin sa mismong araw na nalathala ang anunsyo. Hindi pananagutan ng PEOPLE'S BALITA ang hihigit sa isang maling insertion ng anumang partikular na ad na hindi agad ipinagbigay-alam sa amin.

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
NATIONAL CAPITAL JUDICIAL REGION
REGIONAL TRIAL COURT
BRANCH 67
PASIG CITY
0945 508 2882 (globe) 0929 720 3461 (smart)
rtc1pas067@judiciary.gov.ph (email)

IN THE MATTER OF PETITIONER FOR RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN JUDGMENT

MARJORIE DAGAR IWAMOTO, Petitioner,
Sp. Proc. Case No. R-PSG-25-00229-SP
-versus- For: Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgment

KATSUYA IWAMOTO, THE CITY CIVIL REGISTRAR OF PASIG, PHILIPPINE STATISTICS AUTHORITY, AND ALL OTHER PERSONS WHO MAY HAVE INTEREST.

Respondents.

x-----x

ORDER

Filed before this court is a verified Petition for Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Judgment filed by petitioner Marjorie Dagar Iwamoto thru counsel.

WHEREFORE, notice is hereby given that the said petition will be heard by this Court sitting at the Third Floor, Bulwagan ng Katarungan, Pasig City on April 11, 2025 at 8:30 o'clock in the morning, at which place, date and hour aforesaid, all interested persons are hereby cited to appear and show cause, if any they have, why said petition should not be granted.

Let this Order be published in a newspaper of general circulation once a week for three (3) consecutive weeks at the expense of the petitioner within five (5) days upon receipt of the Order.

Accordingly, considering that the address of respondent Katsuya Iwamoto is a resident of Gunma Ken Tatebayashi Shi, Hirouchi Cho, 12-26 Frea Hiruchi Apato 1-107, Japan, the petitioner is ordered to notify the respondent by furnishing a copy of this petition and this Order, pursuant to Sec. 5, Rule 13 of the Rules of Court in relation to Section 4 & 5 of Rule 108 of the Rules of Court. Failure to do so will be a ground for dismissal of the petition. Petitioner is given the option to serve the notice to Katsuya Iwamoto at petitioner's expense, be it thru personal service, registered mail, accredited courier, electronic mail or other electronic means.

The Office of the Clerk of Court is directed to include the above entitled case in the Judicial Raffle pursuant to En Banc Resolution A.M. No. 01-1-07-SC dated 16 October 2001 and as reiterated in OCA Circular No. 78-2005 particularly Section 10. SO ORDERED.

Pasig City January 31, 2025
IRA FRITZIE C. CRUZ-ROJO
Presiding Judge
PB•Pub.Date: March 8, 15 and 22, 2025.

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising and Regulatory Board
East Avenue, Quezon City
CASE NO. 2018-36663
Application for Extension of Validity of a Certificate of a Public Convenience to operate a Truck-for-hire (TH) Service.
ARIEL F. VILLONO,
Applicant/s.

NOTICE OF HEARING
Applicant is a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TH Freight-Truck Service within SAN JOSE, OCCIDENTAL MINDORO to any point in the Philippines with the use of TWO (2) unit/s, which certificate is valid up to FEBRU-



ORDINANCE NO. 1255, Series of 2025 AN ORDINANCE AMENDING SECTION 6(D) OF ORDINANCE NO. 990, SERIES OF 2022, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE "HOME CARE SUPPORT SERVICES ORDINANCE OF VALENZUELA CITY" REMOVING THE AGE LIMIT TO QUALIFY AS HOME CARE VOLUNTEERS FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (PWDs) AND SENIOR CITIZENS.

Authored by : Coun. NIÑA SHIELA B. LOPEZ

SECTION 1. AMENDMENT.

Section 6 of Ordinance No. 990, Series of 2022, is hereby amended to read as follows:

SECTION 6. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION OF VOLUNTEERS.

The following shall be the primary factors in identifying volunteers for the Home Care Support Services of the City, viz:

- a. Members of the community who are willing, interested, capable, and who can commit time to provide home care support services to senior citizens and PWDs;
- b. With good interpersonal relationship/good standing in the community;
- c. Has a basic knowledge and training in handling Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) and Senior Citizens with special needs;
- d. For Senior Citizen and Persons with Disabilities (PWDs) Home Care Volunteers:
 - Must be a registered Senior Citizen in Valenzuela City
 - With no age limit
 - Must be physically and mentally fit to serve
 - With Fit-to-work certificate from a medical health doctor/practitioner" x x x

SECTION 2. REPEALING CLAUSE.

All ordinances, local issuances, or rules inconsistent with the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby repealed or modified accordingly.

SECTION 3. SEPARABILITY CLAUSE.

If any provision or part of this Ordinance is declared invalid or unconstitutional, the remaining provisions not affected thereby shall remain in full force and effect.

SECTION 4. EFFECTIVITY - This Ordinance shall take effect on the day following its publication in a newspaper of general circulation pursuant to Section 511(a) of the Local Government Code. Approved on the 109th Regular Session of the Sangguniang Panlungsod of Valenzuela, February 24, 2025.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Attested: ENRIQUE A. TORRES
OIC- Secretary to the Sanggunian

ORIGINAL SIGNED

Certified Correct: HON. LORENA NATIVIDAD-BORJA
City Vice Mayor

ORIGINAL SIGNED

HON. WESLIE T. GATCHALIAN
City Mayor

PB•Pub.Date: March 8, 2025.

DEED OF EXTRAJUDICIAL SETTLEMENT OF ESTATE WITH ABSOLUTE SALE

Notice is hereby given that the estate of the late **ULDERICO SANGCO VIZCARRA and NONILYN TANGGA VIZCARRA** was extrajudicially settled by and among their heirs before Atty. Raul G. Coralde, Notary Public of Pasig City as Doc. No. 516; Page No. 105; Book No. XXXII; Series of 2025.

PB•Pub.Date: March 8, 15 and 22, 2025.

ERRATUM:

Applicant name **EUGENIO CARVAJAL BUSTAMANTE**; it should be "with the use of TWO (2) units" and not as published.

Applicant is a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a Transportation Network Vehicle Service (TNVS) on the route within METRO MANILA which includes MUCPEP AREA with the use of ONE (1) unit/s, which certificate is valid up to AUGUST 28, 2025. In the application filed on FEBRUARY 17, 2025, applicant requested authority to extend the validity of the said Certificate within the use of same number of unit/s.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 21, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at its Office at the above address. (face-to-face hearing).

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in ONE (1) daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon. Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written oppositions supported by documentary evidence on or before the above date furnishing a copy of the same to the applicant/s and may if they so, desire appear on said date and time.

This application will be acted upon by this Board on the basis of its records and documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless the Board deems it necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence.

WITNESS the Honorable ATTY. TEOFILO E. GUADIZ III, CESO V, Chairperson, this FEBRUARY 26, 2025.

ATTY. FREDERICK L. VALERO
Chief, Legal Division

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising and Regulatory Board
East Avenue, Quezon City
CASE NO. 2018-2388

Application for Extension of Validity of a Certificate of a Public Convenience to operate a Transportation Network Vehicle Service (TNVS).
DENNIS DURANO,
Applicant/s.

x-----x

NOTICE OF HEARING

Applicant is a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a Transportation Network Vehicle Service (TNVS) on the route within METRO MANILA which includes MUCPEP AREA with the use of ONE (1) unit/s, which certificate is valid up to AUGUST 28, 2025. In the application filed on FEBRUARY 17, 2025, applicant requested authority to extend the validity of the said Certificate within the use of same number of unit/s.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 21, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at its Office at the above address. (face-to-face hearing).

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in ONE (1) daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon.

Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written oppositions supported by documentary evidence on or before the above date furnishing a copy of the same to the applicant/s and may if they so, desire appear on said date and time.

This application will be acted upon by this Board on the basis of its records and documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless the Board deems it necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence.

WITNESS the Honorable ATTY. TEOFILO E. GUADIZ III, CESO V, Chairperson, this FEBRUARY 25, 2025.

ATTY. FREDERICK L. VALERO
Chief, Legal Division

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising and Regulatory Board
East Avenue, Quezon City
CASE NO. 24-27691 (2012-0447)

Application for Sale and Transfer of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TAXI AIRCONDITIONED (TX) service.
IRENE B. TOLENTINO - VENDOR
RINA O. SEVILLANO - VENDEE,
Applicant/s.

x-----x

SECOND

NOTICE OF HEARING

Applicant request approval of the sale made by IRENE B. TOLENTINO in favor of RINA O. SEVILLANO of a Certificate of Public Convenience issued in Case No. 2012-0447 to operate a TAXI AIRCONDITIONED service within CALOOCAN CITY to any point in the island of LUZON with the use of ONE (1) units and including in the said sale ONE (1) unit/s which Certificate is valid up to NOVEMBER 14, 2027.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 21, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at its Office at the above address. (face-to-face hearing).

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in ONE (1) daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon.

Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written opposition supported by documentary evidences on or before the above date, furnishing a copy of the same to applicant and may, if so desires, appear on the scheduled date of hearing.

This application will be acted upon by the Board on the basis of its records and the documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless this Board deems necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence.

WITNESS the Honorable ATTY. TEOFILO E. GUADIZ III, CESO V, Chairperson, this FEBRUARY 18, 2025.

ATTY. FREDERICK L. VALERO
Chief, Legal Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
Department of Human Settlements and Urban Development
Kagawaran ng Pananahang Pantao at Pagsapaulad ng Kalunsuran
«Regional Office»

PAUNAWA

Ipinaunawa na ang **Rockwell Land Corporation** (May-Ari/Taga-Debelop) ay Nagharap sa Departamento na ito ng aplikasyon para sa pagbebenta ng mga lote sa **BEL-AIR AT ROCKWELL CENTER BACOLOD-PHASE II** na matatagpuan sa Brgy. Mandalagan, Bacolod City at sinasakop ng mga sumusunod:

Lot No.	AREA (SQ. M.)	TITLE NO.
Lot 1	72,745.00	092-2021002706
Lot 1495-B-1	3,096.00	092-2024001397
TOTAL	75,841.00	

Lahat ng mga kasulatang kaugnay nito ay maaring suriin ng sinuman na nagtataglay ng ligal na interes dito matapos humiling ng pagsusuri at magbayad ng kaukulang halaga sa tanggapang ito.

Kapag walang sagabal na legal, ang proyektong nabanggit ay ituturing na rehistrado na at maaari nang bigyan ng sertipiko bilang katibayan nito, pagkalipas ng limang (5) araw mula sa huling paglathala. Lungsod ng Iloilo, Pilipinas, ika-27 ng Pebrero, 202

EnP. EVA MARIA P. MARFIL
Regional Director

PB•Pub.Date: March 1 and 8, 2025.

EXTRAJUDICIAL SETTLEMENT OF ESTATE

Notice is hereby given that the estate of the late **TEOTEMIO CARAMPATANA SADAY** who died intestate on September 6, 2018 at Brgy. Cabantao, Rosario, Agusan del Sur. Left one parcel of real property more particularly described as follows, to wit: **Transfer Certificate of Title No. T-1246673**, which has been extrajudicially settled by and among his heirs as per instrument dated on February 27, 2025 under Doc. No. 203; Page No. 42; Book No. 17; Series of 2025. Before Notary Public Atty. Mariline M. Lee of Quezon City.
PB•Pub.Date: March 1, 8 and 15, 2025.

EXTRA-JUDICIAL SETTLEMENT OF ESTATE OF SIMEON CHUNACO

ALFONSO JR. and EDITHA CHUNACO ALFONSO WITH WAIVER OF RIGHTS

Notice is hereby given that the Estate of the deceased **EDITHA CHUNACO ALFONSO** who died intestate on 22 June 2016 and **SIMEON CHUNACO ALFONSO JR.**, who died intestate on 7 August 2019, left a parcel of land covered by TCT No. 133445, which has been extrajudicially settled by and among their heirs with waiver of rights as per instrument dated on February 17, 2025 under Doc. No. 11; Page No. 4; Book No. 01; Series of 2025. Before Notary Public Atty. Ansheline Mae A. Bacudio of Quezon City.
PB•Pub.Date: Feb. 22, Mar. 1 and 8, 2025.

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising and Regulatory Board
East Avenue, Quezon City
CASE NO. 95-15641ST

Application for Extension of Validity of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TAXI AIRCONDITIONED Service.
RODOLFO VALDECANTOS,
Applicant/s.

x-----x

NOTICE OF HEARING

Applicant is a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TAXI AIRCONDITIONED service within QUEZON CITY to any point in the island of LUZON with the use of ONE (1) units which Certificate is valid up to SEPTEMBER 15, 2025. In the application filed on FEBRUARY 14, 2025, applicant request authority to extend the validity of the said Certificate within the same territory with the use of the same number of unit.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 20, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at its Office at the above address. (face-to-face hearing).

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in ONE (1) daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon.

Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written opposition supported by documentary evidences on or before the above date, furnishing a copy of the same to applicant and may, if so desires, appear on the scheduled date of hearing.

This application will be acted upon by the Board on the basis of its records and the documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless this Board deems necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence.

WITNESS the Honorable ATTY. TEOFILO E. GUADIZ III, CESO V, Chairperson, this FEBRUARY 25, 2025.

ATTY. FREDERICK L. VALERO
Chief, Legal Division

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising and Regulatory Board
East Avenue, Quezon City
CASE NO. 95-14217ST

Application for Extension of Validity of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TAXI AIRCONDITIONED Service.
RODOLFO VALDECANTOS,
Applicant/s.

x-----x

NOTICE OF HEARING

Applicant is a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TAXI AIRCONDITIONED service within MANILA to any point in the island of LUZON with the use of ONE (1) units which Certificate is valid up to AUGUST 16, 2025. In the applica-

tion filed on FEBRUARY 14, 2025, applicant request authority to extend the validity of the said Certificate within the same territory with the use of the same number of unit.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 20, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. at its Office at the above address. (face-to-face hearing).

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in ONE (1) daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon.

Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written opposition supported by documentary evidences on or before the above date, furnishing a copy of the same to applicant and may, if so desires, appear on the scheduled date of hearing.

This application will be acted upon by the Board on the basis of its records and the documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless this Board deems necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence.

WITNESS the Honorable ATTY. TEOFILO E. GUADIZ III, CESO V, Chairperson, this FEBRUARY 25, 2025.

ATTY. FREDERICK L. VALERO
Chief, Legal Division

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising and Regulatory Board
Regional Office No. 02, Tuguegarao City
CASE NO. 2018-02-0076

ELISA SANTOS,
Applicant/s.

x-----x

NOTICE OF HEARING

Applicant is a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a TH service along the route: SANTIAGO, ISABELA & TO ANY POINT OF LUZON with the above-entitled case with the use of TWO (2) unit/s. In the application filed MARCH 3, 2025 applicant/s requests authority to extend the validity of said CPC on the same route and number of unit/s.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on APRIL 30, 2025 at 10:00 A.M. at its office at the above address.

At least TEN (10) days prior to the above date, applicant shall publish this Notice in a newspaper of general circulation.

Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written oppositions supported by on or before the above date furnishing a copy of the same to the applicant and shall appear on said date and time.

The application will be acted upon by this Board on the basis of its records and the documentary and/or oral evidences.

WITNESS the Hon. ATTY. RICHARD G. DAYAG, Regional Director, this 3rd day of MARCH 2025 at Tuguegarao City, Cagayan.

ATTY. JINKY A. ZIPAGAN
Attorney IV

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
REGIONAL TRIAL COURT
NATIONAL CAPITAL
JUDICIAL REGION
PASIG CITY BRANCH 71
rtc1pas071@judiciary.gov.ph
0961-6192032

SANDOVAL DISTRIBUTORS, INC.,

-versus- Plaintiff,
Case No. **R-PSG-23-02137-CV**
APOLLOPLUS DISTRIBUTION, INC., GERARD GARCIA, ARLENE MANUEL JOSEPH YAMBAO AND WILLY BALLERDA, Defendants.

x-----x
DECISION

For decision is plaintiff Sandoval Distributors, Inc.'s,¹ complaint for sum of money against defendants Apolloplus Distribution, Inc.,² Gerard Garcia, Arlene Manuel, Joseph Yambao and Willy Ballerda.³ The complaint alleged that plaintiff is a domestic corporation engaged in the business of sale and distribution of pharmaceutical goods, medicines and related products. On the other hand, defendant Apolloplus is engaged in retail business while defendants Garcia, Manuel, Yambao and Ballerda are its officers. The individual defendants approached plaintiff's President James Sandoval and falsely represented that defendant Apolloplus possessed the qualifications, property and credit to secure orders of medicines, vaccines and paraphernalia. They also induced plaintiff to deliver such orders by issuing BDO Check No. 147202 dated October 8, 2019. Consequently, plaintiff delivered their orders

covered by Sales Invoice no. 93654 dated September 28, 2019 amounting to P7,463,500.00) and Sales Invoice #93970 dated October 3, 2019 amounting to P660,000.00 or in the total amount of P8,050,968.75.

The foregoing purchases were delivered per Collection Receipt no. 67228 dated September 28, 2019. Thereafter, defendants issued a postdated BDO Check no. 0000147202 dated October 28, 2019 covering the amount of P8,050,968.75

When defendants' obligation became due in October, 2019, they pleaded to defer payment and ordered to hold the encashment of BDO Check No. 0000147202 dated October 28, 2019 covering the amount of P8,050,968.75. Plaintiff made several demands upon the defendants based on the Statement of Account dated March 18, 2021. However, despite demand, defendants failed to pay their obligation. Hence, plaintiff filed this case for sum of money.

Per Sheriff's Return of Summons dated December 14, 2023, the summons was returned unserved.

On February 28, 2024, plaintiff filed a Motion to Serve Summons by Publication, which the court granted per Order dated March 5, 2024

On March 11, 2024, summons by publication was issued. Subsequently, plaintiff caused the publication of the summons at the Manila Times on April

5, 2024 per Affidavit of Publication dated April 5, 2024. As no responsive pleading was filed, plaintiff filed a Motion to Declare Defendant (sic) in Default on September 27, 2024. The court granted the motion and declared all defendants *in default* per Order dated October 14, 2024. Further, plaintiff was allowed to present its evidence ex-parte.

PLAINTIFF'S EVIDENCE EX-PARTE

During the presentation of the plaintiff's evidence, the latter's sole witness Margie J. Solomon testified on direct examination through her Judicial Affidavit⁴. She stated that she is plaintiff's Account Receivable Officer and was duly authorized to represent the plaintiff in this case per Secretary's Certificate⁵.

As an account receivable officer, one of Solomon's duties is to supervise the collection, payment, sales and billings to the customers and principals.

Solomon alleged that defendants Garcia, Manuel, Yambao and Ballerda approached plaintiff's President James Sandoval and falsely represented and pretended that defendant Apolloplus possessed the qualifications, property, resources and credit in securing medicines, vaccines and paraphernalia from the plaintiff. Due to defendants' representation, plaintiff delivered the former's orders covered by Sales Invoice no. 93654⁶ dated September 28, 2019 amounting to P7,463,500.00 and Sales Invoice no. 93970⁷ dated October 3, 2019 amounting to P660,000.00 or in the total amount of P8,050,968.75.

The said delivered purchases were supported by a Collection Receipt no. 67228⁸ dated September 28, 2019. Thereafter, defendants issued a postdated BDO Check no. 0000147202⁹ dated October 28, 2019 covering the total amount of P8,050,968.75.

When their obligation was due in October, 2019, defendants pleaded to defer payment and ordered to hold the encashment of the BDO Check no. 0000147202 dated October 28, 2019 citing cash flow problems. Later, defendants Garcia as President and Manuela as Chief Financial Officer issued BDO Check no. 0000167457¹⁰ dated April 28, 2020 while defendant Yambao as General

Manager issued Check no. 0000167571¹¹ dated July 25, 2022 covering their outstanding obligation of P8,050,968.75 as a replacement of the BDO Check no. 0000147202 dated October 28, 2019 earlier issued. All checks issued were under the account of defendant Apolloplus.

When the plaintiff deposited and presented the BDO check nos. 0000167457 and 0000167571 for payment upon due date, the two (2) checks were dishonored by reason of "account closed".

Plaintiff made a final demand letter with embodied Statement of Account¹² dated March 18, 2021 upon the defendants and the same was received on March 29, 2021. However, despite receipt of said demand letter, defendants failed to pay their obligation.

ISSUE

Whether the plaintiff is entitled to the relief/s prayed for in its Complaint.

THE RULING OF THE COURT

Plaintiff has adduced evidence to establish its claim only against defendant Apolloplus.

As the instant case is for collection of sum of money, it is incumbent upon the plaintiff to prove by preponderance of evidence that it has a legal basis to make all defendants civilly liable. Under Sec. 1, Rule 133, Revised Rules and Evidence, the degree of evidence to be

proven in civil cases is explained as follows: "Section 1 Preponderance of evidence, how determined. - In civil cases, the party having the burden of proof must establish his case by preponderance of evidence. In determining where the preponderance or superior weight of evidence on the issues involve lies, the court may consider all the facts and circumstances of the case, the witnesses' manner of testifying, their intelligence, their means and opportunity of knowing the facts to which they are testifying, the nature of the facts which they testify, the probability or improbability of their testimony, their interest or want of interest, and also their personal credibility so far as the same may legitimately appear upon the trial. The court may also consider the number of witnesses, though the preponderance is not necessarily with the greater number. Expounding the concept of preponderance of evidence, the Supreme Court in *International Exchange Bank (Now Unionbank of the Philippines) vs. Jose Co Lee and Angela T. Lee*¹³ held: "Section 1. Rule 133 of the Rules of Court mandates that in civil cases, the party having the burden of proof must establish his case by a preponderance of evidence. By preponderance of evidence, according to *Raymundo v Lunaria*, [means] that the evidence as a whole duced by one side is superior to that of the other. It refers to the weight, credit and value of the aggregate evidence on either side and is usually considered to be synonymous with the term "greater weight of evidence" or "greater weight of the credible evidence. It is evidence which is more convincing to the court as a matter of belief than that which is offered in opposition thereto."

Moreover, as provided under Article 1315 of the Civil Code, contracts bind the parties not only to what has been expressly stipulated, but also to all necessary consequences thereof, as follows: "Art. 1315. Contracts perfected by mere consent, and from the moment the parties are bound not only to the fulfillment of what has been expressly stipulated but also to all the consequences which, according to their nature, may be in keeping with good faith, usage and law"

From the foregoing, plaintiff failed to provide sufficient evidence to hold defendants Garcia, Manuel, Yambao and Tan¹⁴ explained a contract in this wise: "It is well-established that a contract is the law between the parties. Obligations arising from contracts have the force of law between the contracting parties and should be complied with in good faith. Unless the stipulations in a contract are contrary to law, morals, good customs, public order, or public policy, the same are binding as between the parties." From the moment the contract is perfected, the parties are bound not only to the fulfillment of its stipulations, but also to the consequences which, according to their nature, may be in keeping with good faith, usage, and law. In respecting the freedom of contract of the parties, courts cannot stipulate for them or amend their agreement. To do so would be to alter the real intention of the contracting parties when the contrary function of the courts is to give force and effect to their intention." (citations omitted)

Evidence shows that defendant Apolloplus through individual defendants, officers, purchased and received prior to July 1, 2013, shall not be plaintiff's goods, as evidenced by the Sales Invoices, Collection Receipt and Statement of Account. Hence, it obligated to pay plaintiff the total amount of Eight Million Fifty Thousand Nine Hundred where there is no stipulation, the Supreme Court in the case of *Camp John (P8,050,968.75)*, representing the value of the said purchases. Moreover, plaintiff also established that despite receipt of its demand letter, failed to pay the same.

Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

prising it. Following this principle, obligations incurred by the corporation, acting through its directors, officers and employees are the corporation's sole liability. A corporate director, trustee, or officer is generally not held personally liable for obligations that are incurred by the corporation. This legal fiction, however, may be disregarded through the piercing of the corporate veil-if, *inter alia*, *litigate with third persons or to in-* an illegal act, or as a vehicle for the evasion of an existing obligation, the circumvention of statutes, or to confuse legitimate issues.¹⁵ Thus, the obligations act of the corporation, acting through its directors, officers, and employees, are its corporate obligations, to wit: (1) complaint must allege in the complaint that the director or officer assented to or patently unlawful acts of the corporation, or that the officer is guilty of gross negligence or willfully and wantonly violated employer's liability laws; (2) complaint must clearly and convincingly prove such unlawful acts, negligence or bad faith¹⁶. However, plaintiff failed to satisfy these twin re-

¹³ G.R. No. 243163, July 4, 2022.
¹⁴ G.R. No. 239576, June 30, 2021.

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

prising it. Following this principle, obligations incurred by the corporation, acting through its directors, officers and employees are the corporation's sole liability. A corporate director, trustee, or officer is generally not held personally liable for obligations that are incurred by the corporation. This legal fiction, however, may be disregarded through the piercing of the corporate veil-if, *inter alia*, *litigate with third persons or to in-* an illegal act, or as a vehicle for the evasion of an existing obligation, the circumvention of statutes, or to confuse legitimate issues.¹⁵ Thus, the obligations act of the corporation, acting through its directors, officers, and employees, are its corporate obligations, to wit: (1) complaint must allege in the complaint that the director or officer assented to or patently unlawful acts of the corporation, or that the officer is guilty of gross negligence or willfully and wantonly violated employer's liability laws; (2) complaint must clearly and convincingly prove such unlawful acts, negligence or bad faith¹⁶. However, plaintiff failed to satisfy these twin re-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

¹⁵ G.R. No. 243163, July 4, 2022.
¹⁶ G.R. No. 239576, June 30, 2021.

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

¹⁷ 716 Phil. 267,282-283 (2013).
¹⁸ G.R. No. 198849, August 7, 2019.

plaintiff's obligation to pay the same. Notably, defendant Apolloplus is a corporation. It is a juridical entity that is vested with a legal personality separate and distinct from those acting in its behalf, and in general, from the people com-

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising
and Regulatory Board
Regional Franchising and
Regulatory Office No. IV
Lipa City, Batangas

CASE NO.: 2022-04-00097
Application for Extension of Validity With Change Party Applicant of a Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a PUJ service
EUFEMIO DELISO - Deceased Operator
ROSITA DELISO - New Party Applicant/s.

x-----x
NOTICE OF HEARING
EUFEMIO DELISO (now deceased) was a grantee of a Certificate of Public Convenience issued in Case No. 1990-04-00242 to operate a PUJ Service on the route: BATANGAS CITY - DAGATAN (TAYSAN) IN BATANGAS AND VICE VERSA with the use of ONE (1) unit which Certificate is valid ang subsisting up to 11 JANUARY 2021.

That on 11 JANUARY 2021, applicant requests authority to extend the validity of said Certificate. That on 22 SEPTEMBER 2022, Heir/New Party Applicant, CONCEPCION DE CHAVEZ filed Petition to Change Party Applicant so as to operate on the route by virtue of Extrajudicial Settlement of Motor Vehicle with waiver of rights. That, on

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 27, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. at its office at the above address. (face-to-face hearing)

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in a one daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon. Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written opposition supported by documentary evidences on or before the above date, furnishing a copy of the same to applicant and may, if so desires, to appear on the said date and time aforementioned.

This application will be acted upon by the Board on the basis of its record and documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless this Board deems it necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence. WITNESS the Honorable RADM. LOUMER P. BERNABE, PN (RET.) - Regional Director this 6th day of MARCH 2025.

ANGELO P. QUINTO
Hearing Officer

Republic of the Philippines
Department of Transportation
Land Transportation Franchising
and Regulatory Board
East Avenue, Quezon City

CASE NO. 2024-31413
Application for a Certificate of a Public Convenience to operate a Transport Network Vehicle Service
SAMMY YUGA BONADAD Applicant/s.

x-----x
NOTICE OF HEARING
Applicant filed an application for issuance of Certificate of Public Convenience to operate a Transport Network Vehicle Service (TNVS) within METRO MANILA including MUCEP AREA with the use of ONE (1) unit/s.

NOTICE is hereby given that this application will be heard by this Board on MARCH 28, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. at its Office through online hearing. The Online hearing link will be sent to the applicant's provided email address.

At least FIVE (5) days prior to the above date, applicant/s shall publish this Notice once in ONE (1) daily newspaper of general circulation in Luzon. The Formal Offer of Evidence (FOE) must be submitted at least FIVE (5) working days prior to the scheduled hearing.

Parties opposed to the granting of the application must file their written oppositions supported by documentary evidence on or before the above date furnishing a copy of the same to the applicant/s and may if they so, desire appear on said date and time.

This application will be acted upon by this Board on the basis of its records and documentary evidence submitted by the parties, unless the Board deems it necessary to receive additional documentary and/or oral evidence.

WITNESS the Honorable ATTY. TEOFILO E. GUADIZ III, CESO V, Chairperson, this JANUARY 17, 2025.

ATTY. FREDERICK L.VALERO
Chief, Legal Division

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
4TH JUDICIAL REGION
6TH MUNICIPAL CIRCUIT TRIAL COURT
BURDEOS-JOMALIG-PATNANUNGAN
BURDEOS, QUEZON
2nd Floor Municipal Hall, Quezon Street, Brgy. Poblacion, Burdeos, Quezon
Email: mctc2bjp000@judiciary.gov.ph
Contact No. 0931-795-8013

REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
FOURTH JUDICIAL REGION
6TH MUNICIPAL CIRCUIT TRIAL COURT
Burdeos-Jomalig-Patnunungan
Burdeos, Quezon
EMELYN LEGASPI-ECLAR,
Plaintiffs,
-versus-
CIVIL CASE NO. 2024-61
For: Declaration of Nullity of Deed of Sale with Reconveyance and Damages

MONTERICO, and CHRISTINE MONTERICO currently reside in Lot 11 Barangay San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon, where they can be served with notices, orders, and other processes by this Honorable Court.
9. Defendants CRISELDA DE SERRA ALEXANDRIA DE SERRA and PERCIVAL DE SERRA are the surviving heirs of the now deceased ANGELA MONTERICO-DE SERRA, a deceased child of AMADO MONTERICO.

in the Infanta District of Quezon to demand a certain Leonila Romero to vacate the Subject Property. Pursuant to Mr. Amado's request, Atty. Leynard B. Atienza made a demand letter which stated that the Subject Property was owned by Ms. Pumarada.

Monterico, and Christine Monterico are residing in the Subject Property.
See Entry No. 73603 in Page B of Annex "L".
23. Perturbed by the illicit and unauthorized actions of herein Defendants over the Subject Property, on 25 April 2022, Plaintiff Eclar went to the Subject Property and confronted Defendants to cease their actions. Falling on deaf ears, Plaintiff Eclar was constrained to file a complaint against Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Enriqueta doctored as "Usapin Blg. 13".

32.1. A certified true copy of Ms. Pumarada's Death Certificate was issued by the Civil Registry Department of Calocoon City on 21 June 2023 (a copy of which is attached hereto as Annex "B"). This Death Certificate states clearly that Ms Pumarada died on 24 January 1958.

EMELYN LEGASPI-ECLAR,
Plaintiffs,
-versus-
CIVIL CASE NO. 2024-61
For: Declaration of Nullity of Deed of Sale with Reconveyance and Damages
JEREMIAS MONTERICO, INRIQUITA MONTERICO, ANTO MONTERICO, JOEL MONTERICO, NOEMI MONTERICO, RUTH MONTERICO, MATUSALEM MONTERICO, PANCHO MONTERICO, MILKY MONTERICO, CRISELDA DE SERRA, ALEXANDRIA DE SERRA, PERCIVAL DE SERRA, HAZEL MONTERICO, HANSEL MONTERICO and CRISTINE MONTERICO as the HEIRS OF AMADO MONTERICO, and the REGISTRY OF DEEDS FOR INFANTA, QUEZON
Defendants.

JEREMIAS MONTERICO, INRIQUITA MONTERICO, ANTO MONTERICO, JOEL MONTERICO, NOEMI MONTERICO, RUTH MONTERICO, MATUSALEM MONTERICO, PANCHO MONTERICO, MILKY MONTERICO, CRISELDA DE SERRA, ALEXANDRIA DE SERRA, PERCIVAL DE SERRA, HAZEL MONTERICO, HANSEL MONTERICO and CRISTINE MONTERICO as the HEIRS OF AMADO MONTERICO, and the REGISTRY OF DEEDS FOR INFANTA, QUEZON
Defendants.

11. Defendant REGISTRY OF DEEDS FOR INFANTA QUEZON is the government office which serves as repository of all land records involving registered or titled lands as well as registered transactions involving unregistered or untitled lands in Infanta Quezon such as the Transfer Certificate of Title No. T-31114 in the name of Mr. Amado Monterico. It may be served with notices, orders and other processes in this Honorable Court at Brgy. Comon, Infanta Quezon and at its email address, rd.infantaquezon@lra.gov.ph.

15. Sometime in 2019, however, Plaintiff Eclar was surprised to discover that Mr. Amado purportedly had in his favor a Deed of Absolute Sale dated 23 January 1960 ("Forged Deed of Sale") allegedly executed between him and Ms. Pumarada, whereby Ms. Pumarada purportedly sold and transferred the Subject Property to Mr. Amado.

24. On the same day, Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita appeared before the Office of the Punong Barangay of San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon, Plaintiff Eclar asserted ownership over the Subject Property and narrated how Mr. Amado forged the Deed of Sale and executed a false Affidavit of Loss to transfer the title of the Subject Property in his name. However, Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Enriqueta were adamant in refusing to reconvey the title of the Subject Property in the name of Ms. Pumarada.

33. In Heirs of Arao v Heirs of Eclipse¹¹ the Supreme Court held that "[i]f any one party to a supposed contract was already dead at the time of its execution, such contract is undoubtedly simulated and false, and, therefore, null and void by reason of its having been made after the death of the party who appears as one of the contracting parties therein."

SUMMONS
TO: JEREMIAS MONTERICO, INRIQUITA MONTERICO, ANTO MONTERICO, JOEL MONTERICO, NOEMI MONTERICO, RUTH MONTERICO, MATUSALEM MONTERICO, PANCHO MONTERICO, MILKY MONTERICO, CRISELDA DE SERRA, ALEXANDRIA DE SERRA, PERCIVAL DE SERRA, HAZEL MONTERICO, HANSEL MONTERICO and CRISTINE MONTERICO as the HEIRS OF AMADO MONTERICO, and the REGISTRY OF DEEDS FOR INFANTA, QUEZON
Defendants.

AMENDED COMPLAINT
On 26 September 2024, Plaintiff Eclar received the Honorable Court's Order dated 23 September 2024 directing her to implement all indispensable parties by amending the complaint within fifteen (15) days from receipt or until 11 October 2024. Hence this timely compliance.

12. Plaintiff Eclar's great-grandmother, Felisberta Pumarada ("Ms. Pumarada"), is the registered owner of a parcel of land located in San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon, covering an area of One Hundred Eighteen Thousand Five Hundred and Fifty-Eight square meters (118,558 sqm), and more particularly described in Original Certificate of Title No. 0-7367 ("OCT 0-7367") issued on 20 January 1999 by Office of the Register of Deeds for the Province of Quezon (the "Subject Property").

16. Upon examining the Forged Deed of Sale, Plaintiff Eclar found that it is a blatantly spurious document considering that the Forged Deed of Sale was dated and purportedly executed on 23 January 1960, while Ms. Pumarada had already been deceased since.

25. As a result, the Office of the Punong Barangay of San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon issued a Katibayan Upang Makadulog sa Hukuman, hereto attached as Annex "N", certifying that Plaintiff Eclar may already bring her case to the court for adjudication.

34. Thus, in City of Tanauan v. Millonte,¹³ the Supreme Court had the occasion to decide whether a Deed of Absolute Sale, where the contracting parties were already dead at the time of its execution, was null and void.

Greetings:
You are hereby required, within thirty (30) days after service of this Summons upon you, to file with this Court and serve on the plaintiff your answer to the complaint, copy of which is attached, together with the annexes. You are reminded of the provision in the IBP-OCA Memorandum on Policy Guidelines dated March 12, 2002 to observe restraint in filing a motion to dismiss and instead allege the grounds thereof as defenses in the Answer. If you fail to answer within the time fixed, the plaintiff will take judgment by default and may be granted the relief applied for in the complaint.

1 Basic logic and reasoning dictate that a deceased person cannot possibly enter into contracts with another. Any contract involving an already deceased person at the time of its execution is undoubtedly forged, false, and simulated. Thus, the Civil Code of the Philippines plainly declares such contract void and without any legal effect, precisely because there is no contract at all in the first place, as one of the purported parties was in existence at its execution, and his/her participation was only brought about by forgery and/or other false means.

17. Moreover, the Forged Deed of Sale appears to have been acknowledged before one "Atty. Ello Vedasto".⁵ Upon further investigation by Plaintiff Eclar, she discovered that this purported "Atty. Ello Vedasto had no notarial record in the National Archives of the Philippines (the "National Archives").

18. As part of his meticulously planned scheme to surreptitiously and illegally transfer the Subject Property under his name, Mr. Amado falsely executed an Affidavit of Loss dated 11 February 2008, stating that the Owner's Duplicate copy of OCT 0-7367 had been lost or missing.⁶ In truth, however, the Owner's Duplicate of OCT 0-7367 was never lost nor had been missing in any way because in fact, said Owner's Duplicate has always been and never left the possession and safekeeping of the heirs of Ms. Pumarada. At present, Owner's Duplicate of OCT 0-7367 is in Plaintiff Eclar's possession and safekeeping.⁷

35. In this case, the Death Certificate⁶ of Ms. Pumarada unequivocally indicate that she had been dead at least (2) years prior to date of execution of the Forged Deed of Sale in 1960.¹⁷ This dispels any notion that the Forged Deed of Sale has any semblance of validity.

36. Applying Heirs of Arao v. Heirs of Eclipse¹⁸ and City of Tanauan, Millonte, the Forged Deed of Sale is "undoubtedly simulated and false, and therefore null and void and "produces no legal effect." Accordingly, the Forged Deed of Sale did not convey any legal title whatsoever in favor of Mr. Amado nor his heirs over the Subject Property. On this ground alone, Plaintiff Eclar is thus entitled to have the Forged Deed of Sale nullified for being a simulated contract.

WITNESS the HON. REIGI P. ESTILLERO, Presiding Judge of this Court, this 9th day of August 2024.

2 This case is about an unauthorized occupant of titled land who forged a spurious Deed of Sale and made it appear as if the registered owner, Plaintiff Eclar's great-grandmother, sold the land to him. The forgery is obvious considering that the registered owner was already dead for at least two (2) years at the time of the purported sale. Worse, the notarial acknowledgment was also forged and the actions of the unauthorized occupant subsequent thereto plainly show that there was no actual sale at all.

19. Nevertheless, as a result of Mr. Amado's false assertions in the Affidavit of Loss dated 11 February 2008, and unbeknown to Plaintiff Eclar, Mr. Amado was able to procure a new Owner's Duplicate of OCT 0-7367 pursuant to a Court Order dated 14 April.

20. With all the pieces of his illegal scheme in place, Mr. Amado used the Affidavit of Loss dated 11 February 2008, together with the Forged Deed of Sale and his new Owner's Duplicate of OCT 0-7367, to facilitate the illicit and surreptitious transfer of the Subject Property's title in his name. As a result, and unbeknown to Plaintiff Eclar, OCT 0-7367 was cancelled and Transfer Certificate of Title No. 1-31114 (TCT T-31114)" was issued in favor of Mr. Amado on 15 September 2010.

37. While the undeniable fact of death of a contracting party at the time of the contract's execution already clearly shows that the contract is forged, spurious and simulated, the Forged Deed of Sale in this case is additionally riddled with other material and blatant infirmities that, when taken together, there can be no other conclusion that the Forged Deed of Sale should be declared null and void for being false, spurious, and simulated.

38. In a long line of cases, the Supreme Court has given great weight to the presence or absence of documents in the National Archives of the Philippines.

DINO L. MARTINEZ
Clerk of Court II
REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES
4TH JUDICIAL REGION
6TH MUNICIPAL CIRCUIT TRIAL COURT OF
BURDEOS-JOMALIG-PATNANUNGAN
BURDEOS, QUEZON
2nd Floor Municipal Hall, Quezon Street, Brgy. Poblacion, Burdeos, Quezon
Email mctc2bjp000@judiciary.gov.ph
Contact No. 0932-795-8013
EMELYN LEGASPI-ECLAR,
Plaintiffs,
-versus-
CIVIL CASE NO. 2024-61
For: Declaration of Nullity of Deed of Sale with Reconveyance and Damages

3. Nevertheless, the forgery allowed this unauthorized occupant to surreptitiously and illegally transfer the title over the property in his name to the great prejudice and surprise of the registered owner and her heirs. It is therefore necessary that the Deed of Sale be declared null, void, and without any legal effect for being a forged and simulated contract. Consequently, any transfer of title pursuant thereto should likewise be cancelled, and the original title of the registered owner should be reinstated.

21. Without knowledge of the surreptitious cancellation of OCT 0-7367, Plaintiff Eclar was later informed that Mr. Amado already died on 03 January 2013. Upon further inquiry, Plaintiff Eclar came to know that Mr. Amado is survived by the following heirs: herein Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita Monterico ("Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita"), Anthony Monterico, ("Defendant Anthony"), Joel Monterico, Noemi Monterico, Ruth Monterico, Matusalem Monterico, Rafael Monterico, Milky Monterico, Criselda De Serra, Hazel Monterico, Hansel Monterico, and Christine Monterico, as the heirs of the now deceased AMADO MONTERICO.

22. Thereafter, Plaintiff Eclar discovered that following Mr. Amado's death, Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita, as heirs of Mr. Amado, had been in possession of the TCT T-31114 and had been acting as owners of the Subject Property. Aside from residing in the Subject Property, Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita are also continuously tilling, cultivating, and planting coconut trees on the Subject Property and obtaining profits from selling copras. Similarly, Defendant Amado and Ms. Pumarada. However, Ms. Pumarada, as one of the contracting parties, was already deceased as early as 24 January 1958, or at least two (2) years prior to the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale.

38.1. In Fernandez v. Fernandez,²² the Supreme Court agreed with the trial court's finding that petitioner was pa to prove filiation citing certification from the Records Management and Archives Office that there was no available information about petitioner's birth because the Register of Births was not in file with the National Archives.

40. However, this purported "Atty. Ello Vedasto had no notarial record in the National Archives of the Philippines. Thus, the National Archives issued a Certification that it has no record of the Forged Deed of Sale and there was also no record of a notary public named Ello Vedasto for and within Infanta, Quezon.²⁴ 40.1. The Certification provides: This is to certify that no notarial record is on file

TO: Pancho Monterico, Anthony Monterico, Hazel Monterico, Hansel Monterico, Christine Monterico, and Criselda De Serra, of Brgy. San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon
Greetings:
You are hereby required, within thirty (30) days after service of this Summons upon you, to file with this Court and serve on the plaintiff your answer to the complaint, copy of which is attached, together with the annexes. You are reminded of the provision in the IBP-OCA Memorandum on Policy Guidelines dated March 12, 2002 to observe restraint in filing a motion to dismiss and instead allege the grounds thereof as defenses in the Answer. If you fail to answer within the time fixed, the plaintiff will take judgment by default and may be granted the relief applied for in the complaint.

6. Defendants JEREMIAS MONTERICO, RAFAEL MONTERICO (deceased), ANGELENA MONTERICO (deceased), ANTHONY MONTERICO, JOEL MONTERICO, NOEMI MONTERICO, RUTH MONTERICO, MATUSALEM MONTERICO, PANCHO MONTERICO and MILKY MONTERICO are the surviving children of the now deceased AMADO MONTERICO.
6.1. Defendants JEREMIAS MONTERICO, ANTHONY MONTERICO, MATUSALEM MONTERICO, and PANCHO MONTERICO currently reside in Lot 11 Barangay San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon, where they can be served with notices, orders, and other processes by this Honorable Court.
6.2. Defendants NOEMI MONTERICO and RUTH MONTERICO currently reside in 603 F. Dazo St. Barangay Calbario, Meycauayan, Bulacan, where they can be served with notices, orders, and other processes by this Honorable Court.
6.3. Defendant MILKY MONTERICO currently resides in Barangay Labo, Camarines Norte, where she can be served with notices, orders, and other processes by this Honorable Court.
6.4. Defendant JOEL MONTERICO currently resides in Samar, where he can be served with notices, orders, and other processes by this Honorable Court.
6.5. Defendant INRIQUITA MONTERICO is the wife of Defendant Jeremias Monterico and currently resides in Lucena City and in Lot 11 Barangay San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon, where she can be served with notices, orders, and other processes by this Honorable Court.
6.6. Defendants HAZEL MONTERICO, HANSEL MONTERICO, and CHRISTINE MONTERICO, are the heirs of the now deceased RAFAEL MONTERICO, a deceased child of AMADO MONTERICO.
8.1. Defendants HAZEL MONTERICO, HANSEL

14.1. In a document entitled "Pagpapatunay" dated 01 September 1997 from the Tanggapan ng Punong Barangay, Barangay Cabune, Burdeos, Quezon, Mr. Amado stated, albeit untrue, that since 1959, he was the administrator of the Subject Property owned by Ms. Pumarada:
Ito'y PAGPATUNAY na si G. AMADO M. MONTERICO may sapa na gulang, kasal kay Cazaria Romeo, Pilipino at kasalukuyang sa Bgy. San Rafael, Burden, Quezon, ay siyang namamahala simulana noong taong 1959, sa isang palagay na lupang agricutural na NUMARADA, na tatayo sa Bgy San Rafael Burdeos Quazron (Emphasis Supplied)
14.2. A copy of the Pagpapatunay dated 01 September 1997 from the Tanggapan ng Punong Barangay, Barangay Cabuano, Burdeos, Quezon is attached hereto as Annex "F" and made an integral part hereof.
14.3. The official receipts for the payment of the Subject Property's Real Property Taxes (RPT), O.R. No. 6663717 dated 03 March 1997 and O.R. No. 6024645 dated 09 December 1997, indicated that Ms. Pumarada is the declared owner of the Subject Property. These served as additional proof that Mr. Amado was

22. Thereafter, Plaintiff Eclar discovered that following Mr. Amado's death, Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita, as heirs of Mr. Amado, had been in possession of the TCT T-31114 and had been acting as owners of the Subject Property. Aside from residing in the Subject Property, Defendant-Spouses Jeremias and Inriquita are also continuously tilling, cultivating, and planting coconut trees on the Subject Property and obtaining profits from selling copras. Similarly, Defendant Amado and Ms. Pumarada. However, Ms. Pumarada, as one of the contracting parties, was already deceased as early as 24 January 1958, or at least two (2) years prior to the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale.

39. In this case, the Forged Deed of Sale appears to have been acknowledged before one "Atty. Ello Vedasto", as shown on the third page of the cancelled OCT 0-7367 reproduced below:

40. However, this purported "Atty. Ello Vedasto had no notarial record in the National Archives of the Philippines. Thus, the National Archives issued a Certification that it has no record of the Forged Deed of Sale and there was also no record of a notary public named Ello Vedasto for and within Infanta, Quezon.²⁴ 40.1. The Certification provides: This is to certify that no notarial record is on file

WITNESS the HON. REIGI P. ESTILLERO, Presiding Judge of this Court, this 19th day of August 2024.

8.1. Defendants HAZEL MONTERICO, HANSEL MONTERICO, and CHRISTINE MONTERICO, are the heirs of the now deceased RAFAEL MONTERICO, a deceased child of AMADO MONTERICO.

14.4. On 10 February 2010, Mr. Amado sought help from the Public Attorney's Office ("PAO")

32. A perusal of the Forged Deed of Sale readily shows that it was executed and entered into by the parties on 23 January 1960.¹⁹ The contracting parties under this Deed were none other than Mr. Amado and Ms. Pumarada. However, Ms. Pumarada, as one of the contracting parties, was already deceased as early as 24 January 1958, or at least two (2) years prior to the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale.

32. A perusal of the Forged Deed of Sale readily shows that it was executed and entered into by the parties on 23 January 1960.¹⁹ The contracting parties under this Deed were none other than Mr. Amado and Ms. Pumarada. However, Ms. Pumarada, as one of the contracting parties, was already deceased as early as 24 January 1958, or at least two (2) years prior to the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale.

40. However, this purported "Atty. Ello Vedasto had no notarial record in the National Archives of the Philippines. Thus, the National Archives issued a Certification that it has no record of the Forged Deed of Sale and there was also no record of a notary public named Ello Vedasto for and within Infanta, Quezon.²⁴ 40.1. The Certification provides: This is to certify that no notarial record is on file

with this Office of ELLOVEDASTO, notary public for and within Infanta, Quezon. As such, copy of a DEED OF SALE allegedly executed between FELISBERTA PUMARADA AND AMADO MONTERICO, ratified on January 23, 1960 by the above-mentioned notary

23GR. No. 143256, 28 August 2001. 24GR. No. 146586, 26 January 2005. 25 See Annex "K"

public and acknowledged as Doc. No. 98 Page No. 20, Book I, Series of 1960, is not available in the files of this Office. (Emphasis supplied) 41. Applying the cases of Premiere Development Bank, Fernandez, 26 and Department of Education Culture and Sports, 27 it is clear that even the notarial acknowledgment of the Forged Deed of Sale is forged and spurious. The notary "Atty. Edo Vedasto" is fictitious and without any authority to act as notary. His notarial act in the Forged Deed of Sale is a sham and is clearly intended to mask the forgery committed in this fictitious and simulated contract-all in furtherance to the fraudulent scheme to surreptitiously transfer title over the Subject Property against the heirs of Ms. Pumarada.

42. Similarly, in the case of Golden Apple Realty and Development Corporation v. Sierra Grande Corporation, the Supreme Court declared the deeds of sale therein invalid because one of the contracting parties had no legal personality at the time of the execution, and because the notarial acknowledgment of the said deed contained several irregularities and infirmities. The Supreme Court considered those circumstances, among others, as clear "badges of fraud showing that the contracts were simulated and fraudulent." 29

43. As in Golden Apple Realty, 30 Ms. Pumarada's lack of legal personality at the time of the execution of the Forged coupled with the forged and spurious notarial acknov 16/30 is likewise a clear badge of fraud which necessitates the declaration of nullity of the Forged Deed of Sale for being false, spurious, and simulated. C. Mr. Amado's actions, contemporaneous and subsequent to the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale, affirm that it is a fictitious and simulated contract.

44. In Heirs of Intac v Court of Appeals, 31 the Supreme Court explained that the reason why fictitious and simulated contracts are

29 GR. No. 128122, 18 March 2005. 30 GR. No. 143256, 28 August 2001. 31 GR. No. 146586, 26 January 2005. 32 GR. No. 119857, 28 July 2010.

void is because neither party thereto really had any intention to be bound by it, nor did they intend it to alter in any way the juridical situation between them, to wit: In absolute simulation, there is a colorable contract but it has no substance as the parties have no intention to be bound by it. The main characteristic of an absolute simulation is that the apparent contract is not really desired or intended to produce legal effect or in any way alter the juridical situation of the parties. As a result, an absolutely simulated or fictitious contract is void, and the parties may recover from each other what they may have given under the contract.

45. Thus, in assessing whether a contract is indeed fictitious and simulated, the actions of the purported parties relative to the contract are relevant in showing whether the parties truly intended to be bound by it. In line with this, the Supreme Court has consistently held that in cases involving the purported sale and/or transfer of a real property, the actions of the purported buyer and/or transferee, which contradict the basic principles of ownership, constitute clear badges of fraud, and the simulation rendered the purported Deed of Sale void and without force and effect. 32 7367. 47 In the official receipts for payment of the Subject Property's RPT, it is clearly indicated that Ms. Pumarada relative to the Forged Deed of Sale that may be considered at this point precisely because, as discussed, she had already been long-dead at that time. More crucial to this discussion, on the other hand, is that the actions of Mr. Amado himself relative to the Forged Deed of Sale, clearly show that even he, himself, did not recognize its existence, let alone be bound by it. Indeed, a closer look of the following circumstances shows clearly that the Forged Deed of Sale, purportedly executed in 1960, is undoubtedly fictitious and simulated:

46.1. First, on 01 September 1997, Mr. Amado himself executed a Pappapatunay dated 01 September 1997 before the Tanggapan ng Punong Barangay, Barangay Cabuaon, Burdeos, Quezon, stating that, albeit untrue, he was only an administrator of the Subject Property. In the same Pappapatunay, Mr. Amado

28Rebusquillo v. Spouses Domingo and Emelinda Rebusquillo Galvez, G.R. No. 204029, 04 June 2014; Campos v. Pastrana, et al., G.R. No. 175994, 08 December 2009, The Manila Banking Corporation v. Edmundo Silverio, G.R. No. 132887, 11 August 2005. 33 See Annex "F" expressly admitted that the Subject Property was owned by Ms. Pumarada

46.2. Second, on 07 September 1996 and on 023 March 1997, Mr. Amado paid the Real Property Taxes of the Subject Property, on behalf of Ms. Pumarada The official receipts thereto expressly indicate that the Subject Property was owned by Ms. Pumarada. 34

46.3. Third, on 11 February 2008, Mr. Amado executed a false Affidavit of Loss 35 when he claimed that the Owner's Duplicate Copy of the Property's Title had been lost or missing when in truth, the owner's duplicate copy of OCT 0-7367 36 never left the possession of Pumarada's heirs, particularly, Plaintiff.

46.5. Fifth, only on 15 September 2010 did Mr. Amado cause, however illegally, the transfer of the Subject Property's title to his name, or more than fifty (50) years from the purported execution of the Forged Deed of Sale.

47. The foregoing acts of Mr. Amado outrightly contradict the basic principles of ownership, constituting clear badges of fraud and simulation. 48. All told, for being a void contract, Plaintiff Eclar is entitled to have the Deed of Sale dated 23 January 1960 declared null and void. II. THE ACTION FOR NULLITY IS IMPRESCRIPTIBLE

35 See Annexes "G" and "H". 36 See Annex "A". 37 See Annex "I"

49. Art. 1410 of the Civil Code provides that the action or defense for the declaration of the inexistence of a contract does not prescribe. 38 Thus, in Dinalang v. Intermediate Appellate Court, 39 the Supreme Court held that an action for declaration of nullity of deed of sale is imprescriptible. Furthermore, in Gatmaytan v. Misibis Land Inc., 40 the Supreme Court emphasized that an "action for reconveyance on the ground that the certificate of title was obtained by means of a fictitious deed of sale is virtually an action for the declaration of its nullity, which does not prescribe"

50. In this case, the nullity of the Forged Deed of Sale, is based on the fact that it is fictitious and simulated as shown by the circumstances surrounding the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale, as well as Mr. Amado's inconsistent and contradictory acts thereafter. Hence, Plaintiff, as an heir, can bring the instant action to declare the nullity of the Deed of Sale dated 23 January 1960.

B. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: RECONVEYANCE AND CANCELLATION OF TITLE

51. The foregoing allegations are repleaded where relevant

52. As earlier adverted to, there is no question that the Deed of Sale dated 23 January 1960 is null and void. By virtue of the forgery and fraudulent schemes of Mr. Amado, he was able to transfer the Subject Property's title in his name.

53. In Heirs of Naya v. Naya, 41 the Supreme Court ruled that if the registration of the land is fraudulent, the person in whose name the land is registered holds it as a mere trustee, and the real owner is entitled to file an action for reconveyance of the property.

54. An action for reconveyance is a legal and equitable remedy granted to the rightful landowner, whose land was wrongfully or erroneously registered in the name of another, to compel the registered owner to transfer or reconvey the land to him. 42 As

41 Civil Code of the Philippines, Art. 1410. 42 G.R. No. 1-63561, 20 February 1989. 43 G.R. No. 119857, June 10, 2020.

44 G.R. No. 215759, 28 November 2016. 45 Heirs of Aro v. Heirs of Eclipse, G.R. No. 211425, 19 November 2018.

46 Gatmaytan v. Misibis Land, Inc., 47 the Supreme Court emphasized that an "action for reconveyance on the ground that a certificate of title was obtained by means of a fictitious deed of sale is virtually an action for the declaration of its nullity, which does not prescribe." 48

55. In an action for reconveyance, two facts must be alleged which, admitting to be true, would entitle the plaintiff to recover title to the disputed land, to wit: (i) that the plaintiff was the owner of the land or possessed the land in the concept of an real property, the actions of the purported buyer and/or transferee, which contradict the basic principles of ownership, constitute clear badges of fraud, and the simulation rendered the purported Deed of Sale void and without force and effect. 32 7367. 47 In the official receipts for payment of the Subject Property's RPT, it is clearly indicated that Ms. Pumarada relative to the Forged Deed of Sale that may be considered at this point precisely because, as discussed, she had already been long-dead at that time. More crucial to this discussion, on the other hand, is that the actions of Mr. Amado himself relative to the Forged Deed of Sale, clearly show that even he, himself, did not recognize its existence, let alone be bound by it. Indeed, a closer look of the following circumstances shows clearly that the Forged Deed of Sale, purportedly executed in 1960, is undoubtedly fictitious and simulated:

46.1. First, on 01 September 1997, Mr. Amado himself executed a Pappapatunay dated 01 September 1997 before the Tanggapan ng Punong Barangay, Barangay Cabuaon, Burdeos, Quezon, stating that, albeit untrue, he was only an administrator of the Subject Property. In the same Pappapatunay, Mr. Amado

28Rebusquillo v. Spouses Domingo and Emelinda Rebusquillo Galvez, G.R. No. 204029, 04 June 2014; Campos v. Pastrana, et al., G.R. No. 175994, 08 December 2009, The Manila Banking Corporation v. Edmundo Silverio, G.R. No. 132887, 11 August 2005. 33 See Annex "F" expressly admitted that the Subject Property was owned by Ms. Pumarada

46.2. Second, on 07 September 1996 and on 023 March 1997, Mr. Amado paid the Real Property Taxes of the Subject Property, on behalf of Ms. Pumarada The official receipts thereto expressly indicate that the Subject Property was owned by Ms. Pumarada. 34

46.3. Third, on 11 February 2008, Mr. Amado executed a false Affidavit of Loss 35 when he claimed that the Owner's Duplicate Copy of the Property's Title had been lost or missing when in truth, the owner's duplicate copy of OCT 0-7367 36 never left the possession of Pumarada's heirs, particularly, Plaintiff.

the forged deed acquire any right or title to the property.

Xxx

Needless to state, all subsequent certificates of title are also void because of the legal truism that the spring cannot rise higher than its source. (Emphasis supplied)

59. Furthermore, the Supreme Court stated in the case of Reyes v. Montemayor 52 that registration of the property should not be used as means to perpetrate fraud against the rightful owner of the property, thus:

Insofar as a person who fraudulently obtained a property is concerned, the registration of the property in said person's name would not be sufficient to vest in him or her the title to the property. A certificate of title merely confirms or records title already existing and vested. The indefeasibility of the Torrens title should not be used as a means to perpetrate fraud against the rightful owner of real property. Good faith must concur with registration because otherwise, registration would be an exercise in futility. A Torrens title does not furnish a shield for fraud, notwithstanding the long-standing rule that registration is a constructive notice of title binding upon the whole world. (Emphasis supplied)

60. In this case, Mr. Amado used the Forged Deed of Sale to facilitate the illegal transfer of the Subject Property's title in his name. 35GR. No. 166516, 03 September 2009.

As a result, OCT 0-7367 was surreptitiously cancelled and TCT-31114 was improperly issued under the name of Mr. Amado on 15 September 2010.

61. In the event that the Forged Deed of Sale is declared null and void pursuant to Arts. 37, 41, 1346, and 1410 of the Civil Code, Plaintiff is entitled to the cancellation of TCT No. 31114, the reconveyance of the Subject Property, and ultimately, to the reinstatement of the OCT No. 0-7367.

C. THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION: DAMAGES

62. Plaintiff Eclar respectfully repleads, by reference, the foregoing allegations.

63. By refusing to heed Plaintiff Eclar's just and reasonable demand to vacate the Subject Property, Plaintiff Eclar has suffered sleepless nights, mental anguish, fright, and serious apprehension. This, when quantified in monetary terms by way of moral damages, is in the amount of One Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php100,000.00).

64. Defendants also clearly acted in a wanton and malevolent manner in their adamant insistence of staying in the Subject Property despite demands to surrender the same to Plaintiff Eclar. Hence, Defendants should be made to pay Plaintiff Eclar the amount of One Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php100,000.00) as exemplary damages by way of example and correction for the public good.

D. FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION: ATTORNEY'S FEES, LITIGATION EXPENSES, COSTS OF SUIT

65. The patently unjust and unlawful acts of Defendants compelled Plaintiff Eclar to litigate and engage the services of counsel for a fee of Five Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php500,000.00) in order to protect their rights, as heirs of Pumarada, and pursue their legally demandable and just claims from Defendants.

66. Moreover, in prosecuting the instant case, Plaintiff Eclar has incurred and will continue to incur litigation expenses in the amount of not less than Five Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php500,000.00).

IV. TESTIMONIAL EVIDENCE

67. Plaintiff intends to present the following witnesses:

Table with 2 columns: Name of Witness, Summary of Testimony. Includes Emelyn Legaspi-Eclar and Necitas Romero-Villasenor.

Mr. Amado executed a false Affidavit of Loss stating that OCT 0-7367 was lost or missing where in truth and in fact, OCT 0-7367 has been and is currently in the possession of Plaintiff Eclar. Plaintiff Eclar will also testify that Mr. Amado's actions, contemporaneous and subsequent to the execution of the Forged Deed of Sale, affirm that it is a fictitious and simulated contract. By virtue of the Forged Deed of Sale, Mr. Amado surreptitiously and fraudulently transferred the title of the Subject Property in his favor to the damage and prejudice of the heirs of Ms. Pumarada.

Ms. Claris Romero-Cuento De Serra ("Ms De Serra") is a close relative and niece of herein Defendants Ms. De Serra will testify that it is known in their family, including that of Defendants, that the Subject Property is not owned by Mr. Amado nor his heirs. In addition, Ms. De Serra will testify that Plaintiff Eclar went to the Subject Property on 25 April 2022 and met Spouses-Defendants Jeremias and Inriquitia before the Office of the Punong Barangay of San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon where Plaintiff Eclar asserted ownership over the Subject Property. Plaintiff Eclar demanded Defendants to surrender the title of the Subject Property and to transfer back or recovery the Subject Property's title in the name of Ms. Pumarada's heirs. Plaintiff Eclar also demanded Defendants to vacate the Subject Property.

Ms. Necitas Romero-Villasenor ("Ms. Villasenor") will testify that sometime 1985, Raquel Morga-Legaspi, the mother of Plaintiff Eclar, visited the Subject Property and informed Mr. Zoilo Romero, father-in-law of Mr. Amado and grandfather of herein Defendants, that she was the rightful owner of the Subject Property having inherited the same from her grandmother Ms. Pumarada. Ms. Raquel asked Mr. Zoilo to take care, manage, and cultivate the Subject Property as she was leaving for the United States. Mr. Zoilo recognized Ms. Raquel's ownership and likewise accepted Ms. Raquel's instructions. Raquel then went to the United States leaving the management and cultivation of the Subject Property to Mr. Zoilo. After Mr. Zoilo died, Mr. Amado took over the cultivation and administration of the Subject Property without the consent of Ms. Pumarada. Ms. Villasenor will also testify that Mr. Amado surreptitiously and fraudulently transferred the title of the Subject Property in his name. When Mr. Amado died, herein Defendants took over the cultivation and administration of the Subject Property without the consent of Ms. Pumarada's heirs.

68. Plaintiff Eclar also intends to present the appropriate and relevant officers of Brgy. San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon. 69. Plaintiff Eclar also intends to present the appropriate officers of the Land Registration Authority and the Register of Deeds having relevant jurisdiction.

V. DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

70. Plaintiff Eclar intends to present the following documentary evidence, which are available at the moment:

Table with 2 columns: Annex, Description. Lists documents A through U including Owner's Duplicate Copy of OCT No. 0-7367, Tax Declaration No. 05-0013-00007, Felisberta Pumarada's Certificate of Death, Maura Foliente Morga's Certificate of Death, Raquel Morge-Legaspi's Certificate of Death, Copy of Felisberta Pumarada's Family Tree, Pagpapatunay dated 01 September 1997 from the Tanggapan ng Punong Barangay, Barangay Cabuaon, Burdeos, Quezon, Official Receipt No. 6024645 of the payment of real property tax in 1996 over the Subject Property, Official Receipt No. 6663717 for the payment of real property tax in 1997 over the Subject Property, Demand Letter dated 10 February 2010 from the Public Attorney's Office of the Infanta District Office, Forged Deed of Sale dated 23 January 1960, Certification dated 18 May 2023 from the National Archives of the Philippines, Certified True Copy of the Transfer Certificate of Title No. T-31114, Katibayan Upang Makadulog sa Hukuman issued by the Office of the Punong Barangay of San Rafael, Burdeos, Quezon, Demand Letter dated 21 March 2023, Judicial Affidavit of Plaintiff Emelyn Legaspi-Eclar, Certificate of Birth of Ms. Emelyn Legaspi-Eclar, Marriage Certificate of Ms. Raquel Morga-Legaspi and Conrad Legaspi, Pagbabahagi ng Labas sa Batas (Extra-judicial Partition), Judicial Affidavit of Ms. Claris Romero-Cuento De Serra, Judicial Affidavit of Ms. Necitas Romero-Villasenor.

71. Plaintiff Eclar respectfully reserves the right to present other witnesses, documents, or evidence in addition to, or in substitution of, those mentioned above should a need therefore arise to propose other issues as the exigencies of trial may demand, to cite and invoke other laws and jurisprudence that may be relevant in the course of proceedings, or to amend the Complaint as may be warranted.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the Plaintiff Eclar most respectfully prays of this Honorable Court to:

- 1.) DECLARE the Deed of Sale dated 23 January 1960 as null and void for being forged, fictitious, nonexistent, and without any legal force and effect;
2.) Consequently, to CANCEL Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. T-31114 under the name of Amado Monterico for being issued based on forged and fictitious Deed of Sale dated 23 January 1960;
3.) TO RECONVEY AND REINSTATE the Original Certificate of Title (OCT) No. 0-7367 under the name of Felisberta Pumarada.
4.) ORDER Defendants to pay Plaintiff Eclar the amount of at least One Hundred Thousand

Pesos (Php100,000.00) as moral damages, One Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php100,000.00) as exemplary damages, Five Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php500,000.00) as attorney's fees, and Five Hundred Thousand Pesos (Php500,000.00) as litigation expenses and costs of suit.

5.) ORDER the full and complete accounting and remittance of all profits and income derived by Defendants from the use of the Subject Property. Other reliefs and remedies just and equitable under the premises are likewise prayed for. MOST RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED. Quezon City for Infanta, Quezon. 11 October 2024.

TUNGOL TAN FORDAN LAW OFFICES Counsel for Plaintiff Emelyn Legaspi-Eclar 9H, Jenkens Tower 80 Timog Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines info@tungolandtan.com

JOSE BEN L. CAMPOS PTR No. 4030568/01-03-2024/Quezon City IBP No. 3325456/12-30-2023/Quezon City Roll No. 72733 MCLE COMPLIANCE NO. VII-0023053/08-12-2022 valid until 04-14-2025 ben.campos@tungolandtan.com

SARAH CAMILLE G. FRANCISCO PTR No. 5565761/01-03-2024/Quezon City IBP No. 392105/01-03-2024/Quezon City ROLL No. 74665 MCLE COMPLIANCE NO. VII-0012356/03-08-2022 valid until 04-14-2025 sarah.francisco@tungolandtan.com

GEOFFREY DANIEL R. TUNGOL PTR No. 5565763/01-03-2024/Quezon City IBP No. 412938/01-09-2024/Quezon City ROLL No. 87714 ADMITTED TO THE PHIL. BAR ON 2 MAY 2023 MCLE NO. GOVERNING BOARD ORDER NO. 1, SERIES OF 2008, JULY 4, 2008 geoffrey.tungol@tungolandtan.com

Republic of the Philippines) S.S. Quezon City) VERIFICATION AND CERTIFICATION I, ATTY. JENNIFER DENISE D. GUECO, of legal age, Filipino, and with office address at 9H Jenkens Tower, 80 Timog Avenue, Quezon City, under oath depose and state that: I am the duly appointed attorney-in-fact of Mrs. Emelyn Eclar through a Special Power of Attorney 1 to prepare and file the Amended Complaint for Declaration of Nullity of Deed of Sale with Reconveyance and Damages against Jeremias Monterico, Inriquitia Monterico, Anthony Monterico, Joel Monterico, Noemi Monterico, Ruth Monterico, Matusalem Monterico, Pancho Monterico, Milky Monterico, Criselda De Serra, Alexandra De Serra, Percival De Serra, Hazel Monterico, Hansel Monterico, Christine Monterico and Registry of Deeds for Infanta, Quezon. 2. I have read the contents thereof and the same are true and correct of my own personal knowledge, or based on authentic records. 3. The pleading is not filed to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation. 4. The factual allegations therein have evidentiary support or, if specifically, so identified, will likewise have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for discovery. 5. I have not theretofore commenced any action or filed any claim involving the same issues in any court, tribunal or quasi-judicial agency and to the best of my knowledge, no such other action or claim is pending therein. If I should thereafter learn that the same or similar action or claim has been filed or is pending, I shall report that fact within five (5) calendar days thereafter to the court wherein this Complaint has been filed. IN WITNESS HEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this October 11, 2024 day of ____, in Quezon City, Philippines. ATTY. JENNIFER DENISE D. GUECO Affiant

A copy of the Special Power of Attorney is attached hereto as Annex "A".

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this October 11, 2024 day of 2024 in Quezon City, Philippines, affiant exhibiting to me her government-issued identification card bearing her photograph and signature: Passport ID No. P568930B and attested that she read and understood the foregoing and that she is executing the same freely and voluntarily. Doc. No. 457; Page No. 93; Book No. II; Series of 2024.

NOTARY PUBLIC SARAH CAMILLE G. FRANCISCO PTR No. 5565761/01-03-2024/Quezon City IBP No. 392105/01-03-2024/Quezon City ROLL No. 74665 MCLE COMPLIANCE NO. VII-0012356/03-08-2022 valid until 04-14-2025 sarah.francisco@tungolandtan.com PB+Pub.Date: Feb. 22, Mar. 1 and 8, 2025.

