

A Comprehensive Analysis of Unjust Enrichment, *Solutio Indebiti*, and *Quantum Meruit* in Philippine Law and Jurisprudence

Executive Summary

By Zepharian Valtrix

18 June 2025

This report presents a deep and comprehensive analysis of three cornerstone principles of Philippine Civil Law: Unjust Enrichment, *Solutio Indebiti*, and *Quantum Meruit*. While distinct in their technical application, these doctrines are inextricably linked by the foundational tenet of equity that permeates the Philippine legal system: no person shall be unjustly enriched at the expense of another. This work dissects their statutory bases within the Civil Code, meticulously outlines their essential requisites as established by jurisprudence, and examines their dynamic interplay through a review of both landmark and recent Supreme Court decisions.

The principle of Unjust Enrichment, codified in Article 22 of the Civil Code, serves as the broad, overarching doctrine. It is the legal system's response to situations where a person acquires a benefit without just or legal ground, creating an obligation of restitution. Its corresponding legal action, the *accion in rem verso*, functions as a subsidiary remedy, a tool of last resort to fill the interstices of law where no other specific action, such as one based on contract or tort, is available.

From this general principle spring more specific juridical relations. Chief among these is *Solutio Indebiti*, a named quasi-contract under Article 2154, which addresses the precise scenario of payment or delivery made by mistake. It provides a direct legal pathway for the recovery of what was not owed, with the liability of the recipient hinging critically on their good or bad faith. Recent jurisprudence, particularly in the context of government disallowances and erroneous electronic transfers, has affirmed the vitality and adaptability of this doctrine to modern transactional realities.

Distinct from both is the principle of *Quantum Meruit*—"as much as he deserves." It is

not a cause of action in itself but an equitable measure of recovery. It is the law's mechanism for calculating reasonable compensation for services rendered or benefits conferred when a contract is void, unenforceable, or silent as to price. Its application prevents the unjust enrichment that would result if one party were to benefit from another's labor without providing just compensation. The Supreme Court has judiciously applied this principle, allowing recovery in cases of procedural defects in government contracts while denying it in cases of patent illegality, thereby balancing equity with the imperative to uphold the law.

Ultimately, this report demonstrates that these three principles form a coherent and interdependent framework. Unjust Enrichment provides the fundamental "why" for legal intervention. *Solutio Indebiti* offers a specific "what" for cases of mistaken payment. And *Quantum Meruit* furnishes the "how much" when the law of contracts fails to provide a measure for just compensation. Together, they stand as a testament to the Philippine legal system's enduring commitment to equity and substantive justice, ensuring that fairness prevails even in the absence of formal agreements or when strict legal rules would otherwise lead to an inequitable result.

Part I: The Foundational Principle of Unjust Enrichment

The concept of unjust enrichment is a fundamental pillar of civil law, acting as a safeguard against inequitable outcomes where formal legal remedies may be inadequate. It is not merely a moral precept but a source of obligation recognized and enforced by the courts, ensuring that no person profits at the expense of another without a just and legal basis.

Section 1.1: Statutory and Philosophical Moorings

The legal basis for the doctrine of unjust enrichment in the Philippines is principally enshrined in Article 22 of the New Civil Code. This provision is a direct codification of a timeless equitable principle, reflecting a deep-seated sense of justice that transcends formal legal structures.

Analysis of Article 22, Civil Code

Article 22 of the Civil Code provides a clear and unequivocal statement of the principle:

"Every person who, through an act or performance by another or any other means, acquires or comes into possession of something at the expense of the latter without just or legal ground, shall return the same to him".¹ This article establishes a legal duty of restitution that arises not from an agreement between parties (contract) or from a wrongful act causing damage (delict or quasi-delict), but from the simple fact of acquiring a benefit that, in the eyes of the law, one is not entitled to retain.¹ It applies universally to any situation where a person is enriched at another's expense without a valid justification.²

The Maxim *Nemo cum alterius detrimento locupletari potest*

The doctrine's philosophical and historical roots lie in the Roman law maxim, *Nemo cum alterius detrimento locupletari potest*, which translates to "No one shall enrich himself at the expense of another".² This maxim is not a mere historical artifact but the animating spirit behind Article 22. It provides the ethical and equitable foundation for the principle, emphasizing that the law will intervene to correct imbalances where one party's gain is directly and unjustly derived from another's loss.¹ Philippine courts consistently invoke this maxim to underscore the doctrine's purpose: to prevent injustice and ensure fairness in human relations.²

Source of Obligation

Under Article 1157 of the Civil Code, obligations arise from law, contracts, quasi-contracts, acts or omissions punished by law, and quasi-delicts.⁸ Unjust enrichment is considered a source of obligation that falls under the purview of law, often operationalized through the juridical relation of quasi-contract.⁵ Quasi-contracts, as defined in Article 2142, are lawful, voluntary, and unilateral acts that give rise to an obligation to the end that no one shall be unjustly enriched or benefited at the expense of another.³ Therefore, the duty to return what was unjustly acquired is not a matter of choice but a juridical necessity imposed by law to uphold equity.⁵

Section 1.2: The Essential Requisites of Unjust Enrichment

For a claim based on unjust enrichment to prosper, Philippine jurisprudence has consistently required the claimant to prove the confluence of several essential elements. The absence of any one of these requisites is fatal to the claim.

1. **Enrichment of the Defendant:** The defendant must have received a benefit or become enriched. This enrichment is not limited to the acquisition of money or property. It can also manifest as savings from an expense that would have otherwise been incurred, or the improvement of one's condition or position.¹ The benefit can be tangible, like receiving property, or intangible, such as the value of services rendered.²
2. **Impoverishment of the Plaintiff:** The plaintiff must have suffered a corresponding loss, damage, or deprivation of a property, right, or interest.¹ This impoverishment must be directly linked to the defendant's enrichment, creating a correlative relationship between the gain of one and the loss of the other.
3. **Causal Connection:** There must be a direct causal link between the defendant's enrichment and the plaintiff's impoverishment.¹ The benefit received by the defendant must have proceeded from the property or efforts of the plaintiff, establishing that the enrichment was at the expense of the plaintiff.
4. **Absence of a Just or Legal Ground:** This is the most critical and often most contentious element. The enrichment must be "unjust," meaning it lacks a valid basis in law or contract.¹ If the benefit was conferred pursuant to a valid and enforceable contract, a lawful donation, a provision of law, or a court order, the enrichment is considered justified, and the principle does not apply.³ For example, a person who benefits from a construction on their property cannot be said to be unjustly enriched if the builder was contracted by a lessee, as the builder's recourse is against the lessee with whom they have a contract, not the property owner.³ Similarly, a benefit conferred voluntarily and gratuitously, as in a gift, cannot be recovered under this principle.²

Section 1.3: *Accion in Rem Verso* as the Embodiment of the Principle

The legal action to enforce the principle of unjust enrichment under Article 22 is known as the *accion in rem verso*.⁷ This remedy, rooted in Roman law and equity, allows a person who has been impoverished to recover from the person who has been enriched to the extent of the benefit conferred.⁷

A defining characteristic of the *accion in rem verso* is its subsidiary nature. Jurisprudence has firmly established that it is a remedy of last resort, available only when there is no other legal remedy at hand.⁷ This judicial policy preserves the integrity and stability of other legal institutions. If a party has a remedy under a contract (e.g., an action for specific performance or rescission) or under tort law (an action for damages based on negligence), they cannot bypass these specific remedies and instead invoke the general equitable principle of unjust enrichment.¹⁴

The Supreme Court, in cases like ***Magallanes v. Sun Life Assurance Co. of Canada*** and ***Uy v. Spouses Medina***, has emphasized that the absence of any other available legal remedy is a key requisite for the *accion in rem verso* to prosper.¹⁴ This ensures that equity does not supplant or override positive law. The doctrine is designed to fill legal gaps and prevent injustice in situations not covered by specific statutes or contracts, rather than to provide an alternative to established legal avenues.⁷

Section 1.4: Landmark Jurisprudence on Unjust Enrichment

The Supreme Court has applied the principle of unjust enrichment across a wide spectrum of cases, demonstrating its flexibility and importance.

In ***Yon Mitori International Industries v. Union Bank of the Philippines*** (G.R. No. 225538), the Court provided a modern application of the principle in a banking context.¹⁶ A bank customer, Tan, withdrew P480,000 after his account was credited with the value of a check that was subsequently dishonored. Tan refused to return the money, arguing the bank was negligent. The Supreme Court affirmed the ruling that Tan was liable to return the funds based on unjust enrichment. The Court found all elements present: Tan was enriched by the withdrawal, the bank was impoverished by the loss of funds, and crucially, there was no legal ground for Tan to retain the money, as the check that supposedly justified the credit was worthless. The Court noted that Tan's prior experience with dishonored checks from the same source negated any

claim of good faith, making his retention of the funds unjust.¹⁶

The case of ***Banach v. Guevarra* (G.R. No. 174404)** illustrates the principle's application in the realm of human relations.¹⁷ While a mere breach of a promise to marry is not an actionable wrong, the Court of Appeals had ordered the return of P500,000 sent by a foreign national to his fiancée. The legal basis for the transfer was the intended marriage. When the marriage did not materialize, the "just cause" for the transfer ceased to exist, making the retention of the full amount an instance of unjust enrichment. This case shows how the courts scrutinize the underlying reason for a benefit's conferral to determine if its retention becomes unjust upon the failure of that reason.¹⁷

The principle's applicability is not limited to private individuals. In ***Esteban v. City of Baguio***, the Supreme Court held a local government unit liable for unjust enrichment when it benefited from the use of private property without providing compensation to the owner.¹ This demonstrates that the State and its instrumentalities are equally bound by the equitable command of Article 22.

Section 1.5: Insights and Implications

The body of jurisprudence on unjust enrichment reveals a carefully calibrated judicial approach. The consistent emphasis on the subsidiary nature of the *accion in rem verso* reflects a fundamental judicial policy: equity is meant to supplement the law, not supplant it. The courts use this doctrine as a corrective mechanism to address situations where a strict application of legal rules would lead to a patently unfair result. By requiring litigants to first exhaust specific remedies available under contract or tort law, the judiciary preserves the hierarchy of legal sources and maintains the stability of consensual agreements. This gatekeeping function, evident in rulings like ***Uy v. Medina***, ensures that unjust enrichment remains a remedy for exceptional circumstances, preventing it from becoming a tool to circumvent contractual obligations or the specific requirements of other areas of law.¹⁴

Furthermore, the application of the doctrine is highly fact-dependent, hinging on the judicial interpretation of what constitutes a "just or legal ground." The flexibility of this element allows the principle to adapt to a vast array of human interactions. In the commercial sphere, as seen in *Yon Mitori*, the "just cause" (a valid deposit) was proven to be illusory upon the check's dishonor.¹⁶ In the personal sphere, as in *Banach*, the

"just cause" (a future marriage) was a condition that failed to materialize.¹⁷ This adaptability demonstrates that unjust enrichment is not a rigid formula but a dynamic principle of justice, empowering courts to look beyond formalisms and assess the substantive fairness of a transaction's outcome.

Part II: The Quasi-Contract of *Solutio Indebiti*

Where the principle of unjust enrichment provides the broad ethical foundation, the quasi-contract of *solutio indebiti* offers a specific, codified legal mechanism to address one of its most common manifestations: payment made by mistake. It is the law's direct answer to the question of what happens when something is delivered to a person who has no right to receive it.

Section 2.1: The Juridical Relation of Payment by Mistake

The rules governing *solutio indebiti* are found in Articles 2154 to 2163 of the Civil Code. These provisions create a distinct juridical relation between the payor and the recipient, compelling restitution to prevent an inequitable gain.

Statutory Dissection (Arts. 2154-2163, Civil Code)

The cornerstone of this quasi-contract is Article 2154, which states: "If something is received when there is no right to demand it, and it was unduly delivered through mistake, the obligation to return it arises".¹⁸ This provision is self-executing; the moment a mistaken payment is made and received, the law imposes an obligation on the recipient to return it.¹⁸ The subsequent articles elaborate on the scope of this obligation, particularly concerning the good or bad faith of the recipient.²²

Nature as a Quasi-Contract

Solutio indebiti is one of the two principal named quasi-contracts in the Civil Code, the other being *negotiorum gestio* (the voluntary management of another's affairs).⁵ It arises from a lawful act (the delivery), which is voluntary and unilateral on the part of the payor.⁵ Unlike a contract, there is no meeting of the minds. Instead, the law itself creates the obligation to return the undue payment to prevent the unjust enrichment of the recipient at the expense of the mistaken payor.⁵

Relationship to Unjust Enrichment

The relationship between *solutio indebiti* and unjust enrichment is one of species to genus. *Solutio indebiti* is a specific form of unjust enrichment.¹⁹ Every instance of *solutio indebiti* necessarily involves unjust enrichment, as the recipient is enriched by the mistaken payment without legal ground, at the corresponding expense of the payor.¹ However, not all cases of unjust enrichment fall under *solutio indebiti*. Unjust enrichment is a broader principle that can apply to situations where there is no mistaken payment, such as when one benefits from the unauthorized use of another's property or from services rendered without an agreement.¹

Solutio indebiti is therefore the specific legal framework for the subset of unjust enrichment cases caused by mistaken delivery.¹⁵

Section 2.2: Requisites and the Indispensable Element of "Mistake"

For an obligation under *solutio indebiti* to arise, jurisprudence has consistently required the presence of three essential requisites:

1. **A thing was delivered or payment was made:** There must be an actual, material transfer of value, whether in the form of money, goods, or property, from one party to another.¹⁸
2. **The recipient had no right to demand it:** There was no pre-existing, valid, and demandable obligation that the payment was intended to satisfy. The payment was, in essence, undue.¹⁸
3. **The delivery was made through mistake:** This is the indispensable element that animates the doctrine.¹⁸ The payor must have acted under an erroneous belief

that an obligation existed or that the payment was due. If a payment is made voluntarily with full knowledge that it is not due, it is considered a donation or a waiver, and the principle of *solutio indebiti* does not apply.¹⁹

The nature of the mistake can be one of fact or law:

- **Mistake of Fact:** This occurs when the payor erroneously believes in the existence of a factual situation that would give rise to an obligation, when in reality it does not. Examples include paying a debt that has already been settled, making a duplicate payment, or paying the wrong person.¹⁹
- **Mistake of Law:** Article 2155 of the Civil Code provides an important exception to the general rule that ignorance of the law excuses no one (*ignorantia legis neminem excusat*). It states that "Payment by reason of a mistake in the construction or application of a doubtful or difficult question of law may come within the scope of the preceding article".²⁴ This allows for recovery if a payment was made based on a misunderstanding of a complex or ambiguous legal provision. However, the Supreme Court has clarified that mere ignorance of a clear and settled legal rule is not a sufficient basis for invoking *solutio indebiti*.²²

Section 2.3: Liability of the Recipient: A Study in Good Faith and Bad Faith

The Civil Code makes a crucial distinction in the scope of the recipient's liability based on their state of mind at the time of receiving the undue payment. This distinction underscores the law's emphasis on equity.

- **Recipient in Good Faith:** A recipient in good faith is one who accepts the payment without knowledge that it is undue.²² Under Article 2159, their liability is limited. They are obligated only to return the thing or its value. They are not liable for legal interest or for the fruits of the thing received. Furthermore, they are only responsible for any loss or impairment of the thing to the extent that they have benefited from it.²²
- **Recipient in Bad Faith:** A recipient in bad faith is one who knows the payment is not due but accepts it anyway.²² Their liability is significantly more extensive. Under Article 2159, a recipient in bad faith shall pay legal interest if a sum of money is involved, or shall be liable for the fruits received or which should have

been received if the thing produces fruits. Moreover, they are answerable for any loss or impairment of the thing from any cause, and for damages to the person who delivered it, until it is recovered.⁵

Section 2.4: Prevailing Jurisprudence and Modern Applications (2018-2025)

The doctrine of *solutio indebiti* remains highly relevant, with the Supreme Court consistently applying it to contemporary legal issues.

A significant area of application is in the context of government disallowances. In the landmark case of ***Madera v. Commission on Audit (COA)*** and subsequent rulings, the Supreme Court recalibrated the rules for the return of disallowed benefits and allowances by government employees.²⁵ The Court established that the liability of passive recipients to return what they received is primarily anchored on the principles of *solutio indebiti* and unjust enrichment.²⁶ In this framework, the government is the mistaken payor, and the employees are the recipients of an undue payment. This treats the receipt of unauthorized public funds as a quasi-contractual issue, providing a clear legal basis for the government's recovery efforts.²⁶

The proliferation of digital banking and e-wallets has also brought *solutio indebiti* to the forefront. Legal commentaries and jurisprudence affirm that the principles of *solutio indebiti* are the primary legal basis for compelling the return of funds mistakenly transferred electronically.²⁹ Whether the error is due to a typo in an account number or a systemic bank glitch, the recipient who has no right to the funds is legally obligated to return them.³³

However, the application of *solutio indebiti* is not absolute. The case of ***Philippine National Bank v. Cheah Chee Chong*** introduces a vital limitation.¹⁶ In that case, PNB was found to have acted with gross negligence when it paid the value of a foreign check without waiting for it to be cleared. The Supreme Court held that recovery under *solutio indebiti* is not available when the mistake is the result of gross negligence. The mistake must be excusable, arising from a lack of prudence that is not so severe as to be considered a complete disregard for diligence.¹⁶

Section 2.5: Insights and Implications

The application of *solutio indebiti* in COA disallowance cases represents a significant doctrinal development, functioning as a double-edged sword for the government. On one side, it provides a robust and clear legal foundation for recovering unauthorized public expenditures from recipients, moving away from previous, more ambiguous rules. On the other side, by framing the issue within the equitable context of quasi-contracts, it opens the door for equitable defenses. As explored in the concurring opinions in cases following *Madera*, requiring a full return from a good-faith employee who rendered genuine services could lead to the unjust enrichment of the government. This is because the government would have received the benefit of the employee's labor without providing full compensation. This complex situation creates a direct pathway for the interplay of *solutio indebiti* with *quantum meruit*, where the court may offset the amount to be returned with the reasonable value of the services rendered, achieving a more equitable balance.

Moreover, the negligence exception established in *PNB v. Cheah* serves as a crucial risk allocation mechanism in commercial transactions.¹⁶ It prevents large institutions, particularly banks, from acting with reckless abandon, secure in the knowledge that they can always recover mistaken payments. By placing the risk of loss on the party that acted with gross negligence, the Court incentivizes the exercise of due diligence and promotes sound, prudent banking and commercial practices. This ensures that *solutio indebiti* remains a remedy for genuine mistakes, not a shield for inexcusable carelessness.

Part III: The Principle of *Quantum Meruit*

Unlike unjust enrichment, which is a foundational principle, and *solutio indebiti*, which is a specific quasi-contract, *quantum meruit* occupies a different space in the legal landscape. It is not a cause of action in itself but rather an equitable principle of recovery—a method of valuation used by the courts to determine just compensation when the law of contracts fails to provide a clear measure.

Section 3.1: Conceptual Framework: "As Much as He Deserves"

The Latin phrase *quantum meruit* translates to "as much as he deserves".³⁷ It is a principle deeply rooted in equity, designed to prevent a party from being unjustly enriched by accepting and retaining the benefits of another's services or materials without paying for their reasonable value.³⁸ It operates on the legal fiction of an implied promise to pay for services that are rendered and accepted under circumstances where a reasonable person would expect payment to be made.³⁷ While it is often applied in quasi-contractual situations, its primary function is to provide a measure of recovery.⁴²

Section 3.2: Scope and Conditions for Application

The principle of *quantum meruit* is a remedy of equity, and as such, its application is reserved for specific situations where legal remedies are absent or inadequate. It is typically invoked in the following circumstances:

1. **No Express Contract Exists:** When services are rendered without any formal agreement, but the circumstances indicate that the services were not intended to be gratuitous.³⁷
2. **Contract is Void or Unenforceable:** When an agreement is deemed void or unenforceable due to legal defects, such as a lack of authority, non-compliance with statutory formalities (like the need for a written contract for government projects), or for being contrary to public policy, but one party has already performed and the other has received the benefit.³⁸
3. **Substantial Performance in Good Faith:** When a party has substantially, though not perfectly, performed their obligations under a contract, and the other party has benefited from this performance. *Quantum meruit* can be used to determine the compensation for the work done.⁴⁶
4. **Work Performed Beyond the Scope of a Contract:** When a party performs additional work that was not covered by the original agreement but was accepted by the other party.³⁷

5. **Failure to Agree on Price:** When parties agree that services will be rendered but fail to stipulate a price, the law implies a promise to pay the reasonable value of those services.³⁷

Crucially, the principle of *quantum meruit* cannot be invoked when a valid, enforceable, and applicable contract exists that governs the relationship and specifies the compensation. In such cases, the contract is the law between the parties, and their rights and obligations are determined by its express terms.³⁷

Section 3.3: Landmark Jurisprudence in Private and Public Law

The Supreme Court has judiciously applied *quantum meruit* in both private disputes and cases involving the government, carefully balancing the need for equity against the mandate to uphold the law.

Private Sector Application – *International Hotel Corp. v. Joaquin* (G.R. No. 158361 G.R. No. 158361, April 10, 2013)

This case is a quintessential example of the application of *quantum meruit* in a private commercial setting.⁴⁶ Francisco Joaquin, Jr. was engaged by International Hotel Corporation (IHC) to provide technical assistance in securing a foreign loan for a hotel project. Joaquin rendered extensive services, including revising project studies, preparing application papers, and negotiating with potential financiers.⁴⁶ However, he ultimately failed to secure the loan, which was the primary object of his engagement. IHC refused to pay him, arguing that he had not fulfilled his obligation.⁵⁰

The Supreme Court first determined that remedies under contract law were inapplicable. Article 1234 of the Civil Code, which deals with substantial performance, could not be applied because the failure to secure the loan was a material and essential breach, not a minor deviation.⁴⁶ Similarly, Article 1186, on constructive fulfillment, was not applicable because there was no evidence that IHC had intentionally prevented Joaquin from fulfilling his obligation.⁴⁶

Despite the unavailability of a contractual remedy, the Court recognized that Joaquin had rendered valuable services from which IHC had clearly benefited. To allow IHC to retain these benefits without any compensation would result in its unjust enrichment.⁴¹

Therefore, the Court applied the principle of *quantum meruit* to determine the reasonable value of the services Joaquin had actually rendered. Based on the facts, the Court awarded him and his associate P100,000 each as just compensation.⁵⁰

Public Sector Application – The Dichotomy in Government Contracts

The application of *quantum meruit* in cases involving government contracts reveals a critical distinction the Court makes between procedural deficiencies and substantive illegality.

Application Allowed – *Geronimo v. COA* (G.R. No. 224163, December 04, 2018)

In this case, Mario Geronimo undertook landscaping projects for the Department of Public Works and Highways (DPWH) based on a verbal agreement, necessitated by the urgency of an upcoming international summit.⁴⁴ There was no written contract and no prior certification of available funds, both of which are requirements under the Government Auditing Code (P.D. 1445).⁴⁴ The DPWH acknowledged that the work was completed and had benefited the public.⁵³ The Commission on Audit (COA), however, denied Geronimo's claim for payment, citing the lack of mandatory documentation.⁴⁴

The Supreme Court reversed the COA's decision.⁴⁴ It held that the government cannot be allowed to unjustly enrich itself at the expense of a contractor who, in good faith, rendered services for the public benefit.⁴⁴ The Court characterized the absence of a written contract and other documents as a procedural defect. Since the DPWH had benefited from the services and had acknowledged its obligation, the Court ruled that justice and equity demanded compensation on the basis of *quantum meruit*.⁴⁴ It directed the COA to determine the reasonable value of the services Geronimo rendered and to allow payment thereof.⁴⁴

Application Denied – *Lazaro v. COA* (G.R. No. 213323, January 22, 2019)

In stark contrast, the Court refused to apply *quantum meruit* in the *Lazaro* case.⁵⁷ Here, the Provincial Government of Laguna procured P118 million worth of medical supplies without public bidding and by explicitly referencing brand names, both of which are clear and direct violations of the Government Procurement Reform Act (R.A. 9184).⁵⁷ The public officials involved argued that since the goods were delivered and used by beneficiaries, the government should pay for them on the basis of *quantum*

meruit to avoid unjust enrichment.⁵⁷

The Supreme Court forcefully rejected this argument.⁵⁷ It ruled that the principle of *quantum meruit*, being a principle of equity, cannot be used to validate a transaction that is patently illegal. The violation in *Lazaro* was not merely procedural; it was a substantive breach of a mandatory law designed to promote transparency and prevent corruption in government procurement. To allow recovery on the basis of *quantum meruit* would be to sanction an illegal act and create a dangerous precedent that would encourage circumvention of procurement laws.⁵⁷

Section 3.4: Recent Doctrinal Limitations and Clarifications (2018-2025)

The Supreme Court continues to refine the boundaries of *quantum meruit*. In a recent significant ruling, ***Topbest Printing Corporation v. COA* (G.R. No. 261207, August 22, 2023)**, the Court held that the principle cannot be invoked to reduce a claimant's liability after a COA disallowance has already become final and executory.⁶⁰ In this case, the claimant failed to appeal the COA's decision within the prescribed period. The Court emphasized that the doctrine of immutability of judgments, a fundamental element of the judicial system, must prevail over the equitable remedy of *quantum meruit*. This decision establishes a firm procedural limit on when the principle can be raised, reinforcing that equitable considerations cannot be used to disturb a final and unalterable judgment.⁶⁰

Section 3.5: Insights and Implications

The contrasting outcomes in *Geronimo* and *Lazaro* are highly instructive. They reveal that *quantum meruit* is not a blanket remedy for all defective government contracts but a discretionary tool that the judiciary uses to calibrate equity. The determinative factor is the nature of the legal non-compliance. When the defect is primarily procedural—such as the absence of a written contract, as in *Geronimo*—but the service itself is beneficial, acknowledged, and not inherently unlawful, the Court leans towards equity to prevent the government from being unjustly enriched by a contractor's good-faith performance. In this context, *quantum meruit* corrects a bureaucratic failure without undermining fundamental public policy. However, when

the defect is substantive and the transaction itself is illegal—such as the blatant disregard of mandatory public bidding rules, as in *Lazaro*—the Court prioritizes the rule of law. Applying *quantum meruit* in such a case would effectively reward an illegal act and erode the integrity of laws designed to protect the public interest. This judicial tightrope walk distinguishes between government contracts that are merely "unenforceable" due to formal defects (where recovery is possible) and those that are "inexistent and void" due to illegality (where it is not).

Furthermore, the application of *quantum meruit* is fundamentally a factual determination. It is not an abstract entitlement. As the *Geronimo* case illustrates, even when the Supreme Court rules that the principle applies, the task of determining the "reasonable value" of the services is often remanded to a body like the COA, which is equipped to handle the evidentiary requirements.⁴⁴ The claimant bears the burden of proving this value with competent evidence, such as receipts, market-value data, and expert testimony. In *Lazaro*, one of the reasons the claim failed was the petitioners' inability to provide a factual basis for the reasonable value of the goods procured.⁵⁷ This underscores a critical point: equity is a powerful remedy, but it is not a substitute for evidence.

Part IV: Comparative Analysis and Synthesis

Unjust enrichment, *solutio indebiti*, and *quantum meruit* are not isolated concepts but components of a cohesive legal framework designed to achieve equity. Understanding their distinct functions and their symbiotic relationship is crucial for their proper application.

Section 4.1: Differentiating the Doctrines: A Synoptic View

While often invoked together, these three principles have distinct legal identities, scopes, and purposes. The following table provides a comparative matrix to clarify these distinctions. This structured comparison is an invaluable analytical tool, allowing for a direct, side-by-side examination of each doctrine's core features. It crystallizes

their individual roles while simultaneously highlighting their hierarchical and functional relationships, thereby guiding practitioners and scholars in correctly identifying the appropriate legal principle for a given set of facts.

Table 1: Comparative Matrix of Unjust Enrichment, *Solutio Indebiti*, and *Quantum Meruit*

Feature	Unjust Enrichment (Art. 22)	<i>Solutio Indebiti</i> (Art. 2154)	<i>Quantum Meruit</i>
Legal Basis	Art. 22, Civil Code; Principle of Equity ¹	Arts. 2154-2163, Civil Code ¹⁸	Principle of Equity; Jurisprudence ³⁷
Nature	A general principle and source of obligation that forbids one from benefiting at another's expense without just cause. It is the foundational concept. ¹	A specific, named quasi-contract . It is a direct and concrete application of the principle of unjust enrichment. ⁵	A measure of recovery or a method of valuation . It is not a cause of action in itself but a device to determine the amount of restitution. ³⁸
Core Elements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enrichment of defendant 2. Impoverishment of plaintiff 3. Causal link 4. Absence of any just or legal ground ¹ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A thing is delivered 2. No right to demand it 3. Delivery was due to mistake (of fact or law) ¹⁸ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Services rendered/benefit conferred 2. Benefit was accepted by defendant 3. Expectation of payment 4. Absence of a valid and enforceable contract governing compensation ³⁷
Primary Application	As a subsidiary remedy (<i>accion in rem verso</i>) when no other legal remedy (contract, tort, other	Specifically for the return of a thing or money delivered by mistake . ¹⁵	To determine reasonable compensation for services/materials when a contract is

	quasi-contract) is available. It applies broadly to any situation of inequitable gain. ⁷		void, unenforceable, or silent as to price, or when there is substantial performance. ³⁷
Key Jurisprudential Context	<i>Yon Mitori v. Union Bank</i> (erroneous bank credit); <i>Uy v. Medina</i> (subsidiary nature). ¹⁴	<i>Madera v. COA</i> (disallowed government benefits); <i>PNB v. Cheah</i> (negligence as a bar to recovery); Erroneous electronic transfers. ¹⁶	<i>IHC v. Joaquin</i> (private services); <i>Geronimo v. COA</i> (public contracts, recovery allowed); <i>Lazaro v. COA</i> (public contracts, recovery denied). ⁴⁴

Section 4.2: The Interplay of the Principles in Jurisprudence

The Supreme Court does not treat these doctrines as mutually exclusive silos. Instead, it weaves them together to form a coherent narrative of justice. The relationship can be understood as a logical progression:

- **Unjust Enrichment as the "Why":** This principle provides the fundamental justification for judicial intervention. In any given case, the court's initial inquiry is whether it would be unjust for the defendant to retain a benefit they have received.¹ It is the moral and equitable compass that points towards the need for a remedy.
- ***Solutio Indebiti* as the "What":** If the court determines that the unjust enrichment arose specifically from a *mistaken payment or delivery*, the law provides a name and a specific set of rules for this event: *solutio indebiti*. This doctrine defines the specific juridical relationship that has been created by the mistaken act and dictates the general obligation to return the thing received.¹⁵
- ***Quantum Meruit* as the "How Much":** When the law requires restitution to prevent unjust enrichment, but there is no agreed-upon price to serve as a measure—either because the contract is void, non-existent, or because an offset is being calculated—the court employs *quantum meruit*. It is the tool used to answer the question: "What is the reasonable value of the benefit conferred that

must be returned or compensated for?".²⁷

This dynamic interplay is most vividly illustrated in the evolving jurisprudence on COA disallowances. The Supreme Court, particularly in cases following the *Madera* doctrine, often begins its analysis with the premise that government employees who receive unauthorized benefits are liable to return them under the principle of *solutio indebiti* to prevent their unjust enrichment.²⁷ However, the analysis does not end there. The Court then considers the reverse scenario: would forcing a full return from a good-faith employee who rendered actual services result in the unjust enrichment of the *government*? If the government received valuable services without paying fair compensation, the answer is yes. At this juncture, the Court turns to *quantum meruit* as the mechanism to calculate the reasonable value of the services rendered. This amount can then be equitably retained by the employee, with only the excess being subject to return.²⁸ This sophisticated, multi-layered analysis demonstrates how the three principles work in concert to achieve a just and balanced outcome.

Part V: Conclusion

The principles of Unjust Enrichment, *Solutio Indebiti*, and *Quantum Meruit* represent a vital and dynamic aspect of Philippine Civil Law, embodying the legal system's profound commitment to equity and substantive justice. This report has demonstrated that they are not merely abstract legal theories but practical tools that the Supreme Court continuously adapts to resolve complex disputes in both the private and public spheres.

Unjust Enrichment, as codified in Article 22, stands as the foundational principle. It is the ultimate backstop against inequity, providing a remedy of last resort, the *accion in rem verso*, when formal legal avenues are insufficient. Its strength lies in its breadth and flexibility, allowing courts to address any situation where one person gains at another's expense without a just or legal ground.

Solutio Indebiti gives concrete form to this principle in the specific context of mistaken payments. As a named quasi-contract, it provides a clear and direct legal path for restitution, with a nuanced framework that distinguishes between liability in good faith and bad faith. Its modern application to COA disallowances and erroneous

electronic transfers showcases its enduring relevance in an increasingly complex transactional world.

Quantum Meruit, in turn, serves as the indispensable tool for valuation in the absence of a contractual price. It is the mechanism by which courts calculate "what is deserved," ensuring that a party who confers a benefit is not left without just compensation. The judiciary's careful application of this principle, particularly in government contracting cases, reveals a sophisticated balancing act—weighing the need to prevent the unjust enrichment of the State against the imperative to uphold the integrity of the law. The distinction drawn between procedural defects, where recovery is allowed, and substantive illegality, where it is denied, highlights the Court's role as a guardian of both equity and public policy.

In synthesis, these three doctrines form an interconnected and coherent system. Unjust Enrichment provides the ethical impetus for action; *Solutio Indebiti* defines the specific obligation in cases of mistaken delivery; and *Quantum Meruit* quantifies the remedy to ensure that the restitution is fair and reasonable. Together, they ensure that the ancient Roman maxim, *Nemo cum alterius detrimento locupletari potest*, remains more than a historical footnote; it is a vibrant and essential pillar of Philippine justice, constantly evolving to meet the demands of modern society.

Sources cited

1. Unjust Enrichment — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Unjust+Enrichment>
2. Unjust Enrichment | Principles | QUASI-DELICTS - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/quasi-delicts/principles/unjust-enrichment>
3. Article 2142 2175 Quasi Contracts Paras | PDF - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/449989564/ARTICLE-2142-2175-QUASI-CONTRACTS-PARAS>
4. 2 Principle of Unjust Enrichment - YouTube, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ln2CA67p7Hc>
5. QUASI-CONTRACTS - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/quasi-contracts>
6. www.respicio.ph, accessed June 18, 2025, [https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Unjust+Enrichment#:~:text=Basis%20and%20Principles-,Article%2022%20of%20the%20Civil%20Code,at%20the%20expense%20of%20another\).](https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Unjust+Enrichment#:~:text=Basis%20and%20Principles-,Article%2022%20of%20the%20Civil%20Code,at%20the%20expense%20of%20another).)
7. Human Relations — Bar - respicio & co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Human+Relations>
8. BOOK IV (FULL TEXT) : CIVIL CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES : CHAN ROBLES VIRTUAL

- LAW LIBRARY, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://chanrobles.com/civilcodeofthephilippinesbook4.htm>
9. Sources of Obligations Under Philippine Law - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/sources-of-obligations-under-philippine-law>
 10. Philippine Laws: Obligations and Contracts - Steemit, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://steemit.com/philippines/@paulthebeloved/philippine-laws-obligations-and-contracts>
 11. Definition of Quasi Contracts - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/quasi-contracts/definition-of-quasi-contracts>
 12. Understanding Unjust Enrichment: What It Means and How It May Affect You, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.glennonlawfirm.com/resources/legalities-realities-the-blog/2025/january/understanding-unjust-enrichment-what-it-means-and/>
 13. elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/66858#:~:text=For%20the%20principle%20to%20apply,University%20of%20the%20Philippines%20v.>
 14. PRELIMINARY TITLE — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/PRELIMINARY+TITLE>
 15. Distinction from Accion in Rem Verso | Solutio Indebiti | Kinds | QUASI-CONTRACTS, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/quasi-contracts/kinds/solutio-indebiti/distinction-from-accion-in-rem-verso>
 16. G.R. No. 225538 - YON MITORI INTERNATIONAL INDUSTRIES,* PETITIONER, VS. UNION BANK OF THE PHILIPPINES, RESPONDENT. D E C I S I O N - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/66858>
 17. JHONNA GUEVARRA ET AL., PETITIONER, VS. JAN BANACH, RESPONDENT.DECISION - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/68051>
 18. Solutio indebiti claim in unjust enrichment cases - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/solutio-indebiti-claim-in-unjust-enrichment-cases>
 19. Solutio Indebiti | Kinds | QUASI-CONTRACTS - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/quasi-contracts/kinds/solutio-indebiti>
 20. Mistaken Payment Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/mistaken-payment-philippines>
 21. www.respicio.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Solutio+Indebiti#:~:text=for%20Solutio%20Indebiti-,Overview%20of%20Solutio%20Indebiti,the%20obligation%20to%20return%20it.>

22. Solutio Indebiti — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Solutio+Indebiti>
23. QUASI-CONTRACTS — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/QUASI-CONTRACTS>
24. Mistake of law as basis for solutio indebiti | Solutio Indebiti | Kinds | QUASI-CONTRACTS, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/quasi-contracts/kinds/solutio-indebiti/mistake-of-law-as-basis-for-solutio-indebiti>
25. G.R. No. 242925 - Concurring Opinion - LawPhil, accessed June 18, 2025, https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri2020/nov2020/gr_242925_perlas-bernabe.html
26. ENGR. NUMERIANO M. CASTAÑEDA, JR., * IN HIS CAPACITY AS THE GENERAL MANAGER OF SAN RAFAEL WATER DISTRICT (SRWD), ON HIS OWN BEHALF AND ON BEHALF OF OTHER SRWD OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES, PETITIONERS, VS. COMMISSION ON AUDIT, RESPONDENT. R E S O L U T I O N - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/69847>
27. G.R. No. 242925 - Concurring Opinion - LawPhil, accessed June 18, 2025, https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri2020/nov2020/gr_242925_caguioa.html
28. G.R. No. 185806 - Concurring Opinion - LawPhil, accessed June 18, 2025, https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri2020/nov2020/gr_185806_caguioa.html
29. Recovery of Funds from Erroneous Money Transfer - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/recovery-of-funds-from-erroneous-money-transfer>
30. Recovery of Funds from Mistaken Money Transfer - respicio & co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/recovery-of-funds-from-mistaken-money-transfer>
31. Erroneous Money Transfer Recovery Case - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/erroneous-money-transfer-recovery-case>
32. Addressing Erroneous Money Transfers Under Philippine Law - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/addressing-erroneous-money-transfers-under-philippine-law>
33. Recover Money from a Wrong Transaction in the Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/recover-money-from-a-wrong-transaction-in-the-philippines>
34. Mistaken Payment Philippines - respicio & co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/dear-attorney/mistaken-payment-philippines>
35. A Comprehensive Legal Article on Erroneous Cash-In Transactions Under Philippine Law, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/a-comprehensive-legal-article-on-er>

[aneous-cash-in-transactions-under-philippine-law](#)

36. Unforeseen windfall: Mistake in bank credit - Inquirer Business, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://business.inquirer.net/448511/unforeseen-windfall-mistake-in-bank-credit>
37. Quantum meruit | Practical Law, accessed June 18, 2025,
[https://uk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com/w-006-5761?transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)](https://uk.practicallaw.thomsonreuters.com/w-006-5761?transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default))
38. Quantum Meruit | PDF | Equity (Law) | Restitution - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/60933406/Quantum-Meruit>
39. Attorney's Fees in the Philippines: Understanding Quantum Meruit and Retainer Agreements, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.asglawpartners.com/contract-law/1997/01/27/attorneys-fees-in-the-philippines-understanding-quantum-meruit-and-retainer-agreements/>
40. As a general rule, no advance payment, or any payment made prior to the delivery and acceptance of goods, shall be made to any supplier/manufacturer/distributor, subject to the following exceptions - Annex6, accessed June 18, 2025,
https://www.coa.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/ABC-Help/Updated_Guidelines_in_the_Audit_of_Procurement/Annex%206-GPM%20-%20Vol.2/annex6-101.htm
41. Principle of Quantum Meruit - Philippine Legal Doctrines, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://phlegaldocrines.blogspot.com/2021/06/principle-of-quantum-meruit.html>
42. A Comparative Study on the Law of Unjust Enrichment: Global Perspective - ijrpr, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://ijrpr.com/uploads/V5ISSUE5/IJRPR27171.pdf>
43. Distinguishing Quantum Meruit and Unjust Enrichment in the Construction Setting - The Florida Bar, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.floridabar.org/the-florida-bar-journal/distinguishing-quantum-meruit-and-unjust-enrichment-in-the-construction-setting/>
44. G.R. No. 224163 - MARIO M. GERONIMO, DOING BUSINESS UNDER THE NAME AND STYLE OF KABUKIRAN GARDEN, PETITIONER, V. COMMISSION ON AUDIT, AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS AND HIGHWAYS, REPRESENTED BY SECRETARY ROGELIO L. SINGSON, RESPONDENTS. D E C I S I O N - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/64820>
45. PHILIPPINE SUPREME COURT DECISIONS ON-LINE - Chan Robles Virtual Law Library, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://chanrobles.com/cralaw199783.htm>
46. G.R. No. 158361 - LawPhil, accessed June 18, 2025,
https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri2013/apr2013/gr_158361_2013.html
47. Quantum Meruit | PDF - SlideShare, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.slideshare.net/slideshow/quantum-meruit/28186904>
48. Case Digest: G.R. No. 158361 - April 10, 2013 - International Hotel vs. Joaquin, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.digest.ph/decisions/international-hotel-vs-joaquin?tab=digests>
49. Case Digest: G.R. No. 158361 - International Hotel Corp. vs. Joaquin Jr. - Jur.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,

- <https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/digest/international-hotel-corp-v-joaquin-jr>
50. G.R. No. 158361 - International Hotel Corp. vs. Joaquin Jr. - Jur.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/summary/international-hotel-corp-v-joaquin-jr>
51. Summary: G.R. No. 158361 International Hotel Corp. v. Joaquin, Jr. - LegalDex AI, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://legaldex.com/jurisprudence/international-hotel-corp-v-joaquin-jr/summary>
52. Case Digest: G.R. No. 224163 - Geronimo vs. Commission on Audit - Jur.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/digest/geronimo-v-commission-on-audit>
53. Digest Geronimo V COA | PDF | Public Law | Virtue - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/425532831/Digest-Geronimo-v-COA>
54. G.R. No. 224163, December 2, 2018 - batas.org, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://batas.org/case/gr-no-224163>
55. Case Digest: G.R. No. 224163 - December 04, 2018 - Geronimo vs ..., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.digest.ph/decisions/geronimo-v-commission-on-audit?tab=digests>
56. Geronimo v. COA | PDF | Justice | Crime & Violence - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/438550740/Geronimo-v-COA>
57. G.R. No. 213323 - LawPhil, accessed June 18, 2025,
https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri2019/jan2019/gr_213323_2019.html
58. G.R. No. 213323 - TERESITA S. LAZARO, DENNIS S. LAZARO ..., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/64954>
59. G.R. No. 213323 - Lazaro vs. Commission on Audit - Jur.ph, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/summary/lazaro-v-commission-on-audit>
60. SC: Quantum meruit not applicable if claimant fails to appeal - GMA Network, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.gmanetwork.com/news/topstories/nation/880401/sc-quantum-meruit-not-applicable-if-claimant-fails-to-appeal/story/>
61. SC: No Quantum Meruit Payment in Government Contracts Where Claimant Failed to Seasonably Appeal COA Disallowance - Supreme Court of the Philippines, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/sc-no-quantum-meruit-payment-in-government-contracts-where-claimant-failed-to-seasonably-appeal-coa-disallowance/>
62. lawphil.net, accessed June 18, 2025,
https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri2013/apr2013/gr_158361_2013.html#:~:text=Under%20the%20principle%20of%20quantum,lack%20of%20a%20written%20contract.&text=The%20measure%20of%20recovery%20under,value%20of%20the%20services%20performed.
63. G.R. No. 252079 - ARMANDO G. ESTRELLA AND LYDIA G. CHUA, PETITIONERS, VS. COMMISSION ON AUDIT, RESPONDENT. D E C I S I O N - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/68652>
64. GENEROSO G. ABELLANOSA, CARMENCITA D. PINEDA, BERNADETTE R. LAIGO,

MENELIO D. RUCAT, AND DORIS A. SIAO, PETITIONERS, VS. COMMISSION ON
AUDIT AND NATIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY, RESPONDENTS. R E S O L U T I O N
- Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/66732>