**Digest – G.R. No. 221815**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| G.R. Number | G.R. No. 221815 |
| Date of Trial | November 29, 2017 |
| Court Level | Court Of Appeals |
| Division | Second Division |
| Is En Banc | No |
| Petitioners | Glynna Foronda-Crystal, Petitioner |
| Respondents | Aniana Lawas Son , Respondent |
| Ponente | Reyes J. |

**FACTS**

Here are the plain factual statements extracted from the provided text:   
 The Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Mandaue City issued a decision on November 24, 2006.  
 The Court of Appeals (CA) issued a decision on March 12, 2015, and a Resolution on October 19, 2015.  
 The subject property is located in Compostela, Cebu.  
 The market value of the property was alleged to be ₱200,000.00 in the complaint.  
 The assessed value of the property, according to the tax declaration, was ₱1,030.00.  
 Tax Declaration No. 16408A was attached as Annex "B" to the complaint.  
 A perusal of Tax Declaration No. 16408A revealed that the property was valued at ₱2,826.00.  
 Eddie Foronda was issued a free patent.  
 The case is CA-G.R. CV No. 02226 and was heard in Branch 55 of the Regional Trial Court.

**ISSUES**

The legal issues that the court formally addressed and resolved in this ruling are:   
Procedural Issues:   
 Jurisdiction: The primary issue is whether the Regional Trial Court (RTC) had jurisdiction over the action for reconveyance and damages filed by the respondent, considering the assessed value of the property. This involves determining which court (RTC or MTC) has original jurisdiction based on the assessed value as per the Judiciary Reorganization Act of 1980, as amended by RA 7691. Specifically, whether the RTC erred in reconsidering its initial dismissal for lack of jurisdiction.  
Substantive Issues:   
 Application of the Assessed Value Rule: The court addressed how to determine jurisdiction when the complaint fails to allege the assessed value of the real property. The court resolved the issue by establishing a two-tiered rule:   
 General rule: Jurisdiction is determined by the assessed value as alleged in the complaint.  
 Exception: The rule can be liberally applied if the assessed value is not alleged in the complaint but can be identified through documents attached to the complaint.  
 Validity of the RTC Decision: Since the MTC had jurisdiction over the case, the RTC decision was rendered void for lack of jurisdiction.  
The Court then reversed the Court of Appeals decision, and declared the RTC decision as null and void for lack of jurisdiction.

**RULINGS**

Okay, here's an extraction of the legal issues, resolutions, rulings, and dispositive portion of the provided text. I'll address the issues in the order presented in the summary.  
Issue 1: Jurisdiction and Validity of RTC Decision  
 Legal Issue: Did the Regional Trial Court (RTC) have proper jurisdiction over the case, considering the assessed value of the property? Was the RTC decision void because it was allegedly rendered with undue haste?  
 Court Resolution (as implied by the provided text; the full reasoning is not given): The Court of Appeals (CA) affirmed the RTC decision, implying that the CA found the RTC did have proper jurisdiction and the decision was not void. The text does not provide the reasoning of the CA.  
 Ruling/Holding: (The provided text does not give the specific holding) The CA upheld the RTC's jurisdiction over the case and found no basis to declare the RTC decision void ab initio.  
Issue 2: Validity of OCT and Ownership  
 Legal Issue: Should the Original Certificate of Title (OCT) issued to the petitioner's father be cancelled and a new one issued to the respondent based on the respondent's claim of ownership?  
 Court Resolution (as implied by the provided text; the full reasoning is not given): The Court of Appeals affirmed the RTC decision ordering the cancellation of the petitioner's father's OCT and the issuance of a new one to the respondent, supporting the respondent's claim of ownership.  
 Ruling/Holding: (The provided text does not give the specific holding) The CA affirmed the RTC's declaration that the issuance of the OCT to Eddie Foronda was erroneous and upheld the order to cancel the OCT and issue a new one in the name of Aniana Lawas Son.  
Issue 3: Prescription  
 Legal Issue: Was the respondent's action for reconveyance barred by prescription?  
 Court Resolution (as implied by the provided text; the full reasoning is not given): The Court of Appeals affirmed the RTC decision, implying that the CA found that the action was not barred by prescription.  
 Ruling/Holding: (The provided text does not give the specific holding) The CA found that the action was not barred by prescription.  
Dispositive Portion of the Court of Appeals Decision:   
"WHEREFORE, premises considered, the instant appeal is DENIED. The Decision of the Regional Trial Court, Branch 55, Mandaue City dated November 24, 2006 in Civil Case No. MAN-3498, is hereby AFFIRMED.  
SO ORDERED."