

A Paradigm Shift in Philippine Succession: An Analysis of the Right of Accretion in the Wake of R.A. 11642 and the Full Integration of the Adopted Child

Part I: Foundational Principles of Philippine Succession

The law of succession in the Philippines is a complex and deeply structured field, governed primarily by the Civil Code. It dictates the manner in which the property, rights, and obligations of a deceased person are transmitted to others. To comprehend the profound impact of recent legislative changes in adoption law on the specific successional right of accretion, one must first understand the fundamental architecture of Philippine inheritance law, including the paramount doctrine of legitime, the classes of heirs, and the established hierarchy of remedies for distributing a vacant portion of an estate.

Section A: The Architecture of Inheritance: Compulsory Heirs, Legitime, and the Free Portion

At the core of Philippine succession lies the principle of forced heirship, a system that reserves a portion of a decedent's estate for certain heirs who are mandated by law to receive it. This reserved portion is known as the **legitime**. The estate of a decedent is conceptually divided into two parts: the legitime and the free portion.¹ The legitime is that part of the testator's property which he cannot dispose of because the law has reserved it for certain heirs who are, therefore, called compulsory heirs.³ The remainder of the estate, known as the

free portion, is the part that the testator may dispose of freely through a valid will to any person with the capacity to succeed.⁵

Article 887 of the Civil Code enumerates the following as compulsory heirs ⁶:

1. Legitimate children and their descendants, with respect to their legitimate

parents and ascendants;

2. In default of the foregoing, legitimate parents and ascendants, with respect to their legitimate children and descendants;
3. The widow or widower (surviving spouse);
4. Acknowledged natural children, and natural children by legal fiction (now uniformly referred to as "illegitimate children" under the Family Code);
5. Other illegitimate children referred to in Article 287.

The existence of this system of forced heirship is the bedrock upon which all other rules of succession operate. The rights of compulsory heirs to their legitime are paramount and cannot be impaired by the testator's dispositions in a will, by donations made during the testator's lifetime, or by the operation of other successional mechanisms like substitution or accretion, except in cases of valid disinheritance.³ This framework ensures that the immediate family of the decedent is protected and provided for, reflecting the state's policy of promoting family solidarity.¹ Any analysis of a successional right, therefore, must begin and end with deference to the sacrosanct nature of the legitime.

Section B: Resolving a Vacant Share: The Established Hierarchy of Successional Rights

When a portion of an inheritance is left vacant—whether due to the predecease, repudiation (renunciation), or incapacity of an heir—Philippine law provides a clear and sequential order of remedies to fill that vacancy. This hierarchy ensures an orderly distribution of the estate that balances the express will of the testator with the default provisions of the law. This order of preference is commonly encapsulated by the acronym **I-S-R-A-I**⁷:

1. **Institution:** This is the primary act of the testator in a will, designating a person or persons to succeed to the estate.⁸ If the instituted heir is capacitated and accepts, the succession is fulfilled without need for further remedies.
2. **Substitution:** This is the appointment by the testator of another heir to take the place of the one originally instituted in the event the latter predeceases the testator, repudiates the inheritance, or is incapacitated to receive it.⁷ As an explicit declaration of the testator's intent, substitution takes precedence over

the default legal remedies of representation and accretion.¹² If a valid substitute is named, the inquiry stops there.

3. **Representation:** This is a right created by a fiction of law, by virtue of which the representative is raised to the place and the degree of the person represented and acquires the rights which the latter would have if he were living or could have inherited.⁹ The right of representation takes place in the direct descending line, but never in the ascending line. In the collateral line, it takes place only in favor of the children of brothers or sisters of the decedent.⁹ Crucially, representation is superior to accretion. Where the right of representation is proper, accretion does not occur.¹²
4. **Accretion:** This is the right of co-heirs, co-devisees, or co-legatees, who are called to the same inheritance, to receive the share of one among them who predeceases, repudiates, or is incapacitated, when the remedies of substitution and representation are not available.⁷ It is a default mechanism based on the presumed will of the testator.
5. **Intestacy:** If a vacant share cannot be filled by any of the foregoing remedies, that portion of the estate will be distributed according to the rules of legal or intestate succession.¹⁸ This is the final safety net to prevent any part of the estate from being left without a successor.

Understanding this hierarchy is fundamental to analyzing the impact of Republic Act No. 11642. The new adoption law's primary effect is not on the right of accretion itself, but on the right of representation. By granting the adopted child the full right of representation, the law activates a higher-order remedy. Consequently, in situations where representation was previously unavailable to an adopted child (specifically, in inheriting from adoptive grandparents), the law would proceed down the hierarchy to the next available remedy, which was often accretion. With the grant of representation, the law now stops at this higher level, precluding the need to resort to accretion. The change in the applicability of accretion is, therefore, a direct and necessary consequence of the change in the availability of representation for the adopted child.

Section C: A Deep Dive into the Right of Accretion (*Jus Accrescendi*)

The right of accretion, or *jus accrescendi*, is a core concept in both testamentary and intestate succession, governed by Articles 1015 to 1023 of the Civil Code of the

Philippines.²⁰ It is a mechanism designed to keep the inherited property within the group of individuals specifically chosen by the testator, based on a presumed intent.⁷

1. Legal Definition and Basis

Article 1015 of the Civil Code defines accretion as "a right by virtue of which, when two or more persons are called to the same inheritance, devise or legacy, the part assigned to the one who renounces or cannot receive his share, or who died before the testator, is added or incorporated to that of his co-heirs, co-devisees, or co-legatees".²¹ The rationale behind this right is the presumed will of the decedent. The law presumes that the testator intended to give the property exclusively to the named group of heirs and would prefer that a vacant share be absorbed by the remaining members of that group rather than pass to legal heirs by intestacy.⁷

2. Requisites for Operation

For the right of accretion to take place, specific conditions must be met, which differ slightly between testamentary and intestate succession.

- **In Testamentary Succession:** Article 1016 lays down two essential requisites:
 1. **Unity of Object and Plurality of Subjects:** Two or more persons must be called to the same inheritance, or to the same portion thereof, *pro indiviso* (undivided).²¹ This means they are instituted to the same property or aliquot share collectively, creating a state of co-ownership.²³
 2. **Vacancy of Share:** One of the persons called must die before the testator, renounce the inheritance, or be incapacitated to receive it.²¹ This vacancy is the trigger for accretion.
- **In Intestate Succession:** The rules are more specific. Article 1018 provides that in legal succession, "the share of the person who repudiates the inheritance shall *always* accrue to his co-heirs".²⁴ The use of the word "always" is significant. In cases of **repudiation**, accretion is the mandatory consequence because an heir who repudiates their share cannot be represented.⁹ However, in cases of **predecease** or **incapacity** in intestate succession, the right of representation takes precedence over accretion.¹² If the predeceased or incapacitated heir has

descendants who can represent them, those descendants will inherit the share, and accretion will not occur. Accretion in intestacy for reasons of predecease or incapacity will only happen if the heir has no qualified representatives.

3. The "Rule of Earmarking" (Article 1017)

A critical factor in determining the applicability of accretion in testamentary succession is the "rule of earmarking," as laid out in Article 1017. This rule serves as a key exception to accretion based on the testator's presumed intent as inferred from the language of the will.⁷

The rule states that if the testator designates an aliquot part in a way that makes each heir the exclusive owner of a determinate property, the right of accretion is excluded.²¹ For example, if a testator devises "the northern half of my farm to A and the southern half to B," the shares are clearly earmarked. If A renounces his share, it will not accrue to B because the testator's intent was to give A a specific, concrete portion, not just a share in a collective whole. In such a case, the vacant share would pass to the legal heirs of the testator by intestacy, pursuant to Article 1022.⁷

Conversely, the use of phrases like "one-half for each" or "in equal shares" does *not* exclude the right of accretion. Such language, while designating an aliquot part, does not segregate a determinate property for each heir.²¹ For instance, a bequest of "my house and lot to A and B in equal shares" would still allow for accretion if one of them could not inherit, because the property remains an undivided whole to which they are co-called.⁷ The same principle applies to fungible goods or money; unless specific amounts are earmarked for specific individuals from distinct sources (e.g., "my deposit in Bank X to A, and my deposit in Bank Y to B"), accretion will apply.⁷

4. Limitations on Accretion Concerning the Legitime (Article 1021)

A fundamental limitation on the right of accretion pertains to the legitime of compulsory heirs. Article 1021 of the Civil Code provides a two-pronged rule:

1. **Accretion Applies to the Free Portion:** Among compulsory heirs, the right of accretion can only take place with respect to the **free portion** of the estate, when

it is left to two or more of them, or to any one of them and a stranger.²⁴

2. **Accretion Does Not Apply to the Legitime:** If the part that becomes vacant is the **legitime** itself (for instance, through repudiation by a compulsory heir), the other co-heirs shall succeed to it "in their own right, and not by the right of accretion".²¹

This distinction is crucial. The right to the legitime is conferred directly by law, not by the will of the testator. Therefore, when a compulsory heir repudiates their legitime, the remaining compulsory heirs absorb that share by virtue of their own legal right to it, as their own legitimes are consequently enlarged. This is a direct operation of law, distinct from accretion, which is based on the testator's presumed intent regarding the free portion.⁹ This rule reinforces the unique and protected status of the legitime within the Philippine law of succession.

Part II: The Long Road to Equality: A History of the Adoptee's Successional Rights

The legal status of an adopted child in the Philippines has undergone a dramatic transformation over the past century. From being viewed as a legal stranger with limited rights to achieving full parity with biological children, the journey reflects a profound shift in legal philosophy, moving from a property-centric view of inheritance to one centered on the "best interest of the child." Understanding this evolution is essential to grasping the revolutionary nature of R.A. 11642 and its impact on successional rights like accretion.

Section A: The Old Civil Code (R.A. 386) and the Family Code (E.O. 209): Adoption as a Legal Fiction with Limited Reach

Under the Civil Code of the Philippines (Republic Act No. 386), which took effect in 1950, adoption was viewed as a juridical act that created a personal relationship strictly between the adopter and the adoptee.²⁶ The legal fiction of paternity and filiation did not extend to the relatives of the adopter. Consequently, while an adopted child was granted the right to inherit directly from the adopter in intestate succession, this right was not absolute and did not place the adoptee on the same footing as a legitimate biological child.²⁶

The most significant limitation under the old Civil Code was the denial of the right of representation in the collateral line. An adopted child could not inherit from the relatives of the adopter (e.g., adoptive grandparents, aunts, or uncles) because the legal tie was confined to the adopter and adoptee alone.²⁶ This created a legal firewall between the adoptee and the adopter's extended family, effectively making the adoptee a "stranger" to the adopter's bloodline for successional purposes. Furthermore, the old system did not automatically sever the adoptee's inheritance rights from their biological family, creating potential ambiguities.²⁶

The Family Code of the Philippines (Executive Order No. 209), which took effect in 1987, represented a significant step forward. Article 189 of the Family Code declared that for civil purposes, "the adopted shall be deemed to be a legitimate child of the adopters".²⁸ This provision granted the adoptee reciprocal rights and obligations with the adopter, including the right to use the adopter's surname and inherit as a legitimate child.²⁹ However, like its predecessor, the Family Code remained silent on the crucial issue of whether this newly affirmed legitimate status extended the filial relationship to the adopter's relatives. It did not explicitly grant the adoptee the right to represent the adopter in the succession of the adoptive grandparents, leaving a critical legal vacuum that would later be filled by jurisprudence.³¹

Section B: The Domestic Adoption Act of 1998 (R.A. 8552): Legitimate Status in Name, but with a Judicial Barrier

Enacted in 1998, the Domestic Adoption Act (Republic Act No. 8552) was a landmark piece of legislation that aimed to streamline and encourage domestic adoption, with the child's best interest as its paramount consideration.³⁴ The law contained powerful language regarding the status of the adopted child. Section 17 declared that the adoptee "shall be considered the legitimate child of the adopter(s) for all intents and purposes".³ Section 18 further solidified this by stating that in legal and intestate succession, "the adopter(s) and the adoptee shall have reciprocal rights of succession without distinction from legitimate filiation".³⁴

On its face, this language appeared to grant full and unequivocal equality. The phrase "for all intents and purposes" suggested a complete integration of the adoptee into the legal status of a legitimate child. However, the law, like the Family Code before it, failed to explicitly state that the legal relationship extended beyond the adopter to the adopter's parents, siblings, and other relatives. This legislative silence on the matter of "extended filiation" became the central issue in the legal battles that followed. The question remained: Did being a "legitimate child for all intents and purposes" include

the fundamental right of a legitimate child to represent their parent in the estate of their grandparents? The judiciary's answer to this question would define the landscape of adoption and succession for more than two decades.

Section C: Jurisprudential Analysis of *Sayson v. Court of Appeals* (G.R. No. 89224-25)

The legal ambiguity left by R.A. 8552 was decisively settled by the Supreme Court in the 1992 landmark case of *Sayson, et al. v. Court of Appeals, et al.*¹⁴ This case became the cornerstone of jurisprudence on the successional rights of adopted children for the next thirty years.

The factual background of *Sayson* involved the estate of the spouses Eleno and Rafaela Sayson. Their son, Teodoro, had predeceased them. Teodoro was survived by his legitimate daughter, Doribel, and two adopted children, Delia and Edmundo. The core issue was whether Delia and Edmundo, as adopted children, could represent their deceased adoptive father, Teodoro, in inheriting from the estate of their adoptive grandparents, Eleno and Rafaela.³⁶

The Supreme Court's ruling was clear and created a sharp distinction. It held that Doribel, as the legitimate biological granddaughter, had the full right to represent her deceased father Teodoro in the inheritance from her grandparents' estate. However, the Court denied this same right to Delia and Edmundo.¹⁴ The Court's ratio decidendi established what came to be known as the "**Doctrine of Exclusivity**" in adoption:

"While it is true that the adopted child shall be deemed to be a legitimate child and have the same right as the latter, these rights do not include the right of representation. The relationship created by the adoption is between only the adopting parents and the adopted child and does not extend to the blood relatives of either party."¹⁴

This ruling, while legally anchored on the statutes of the time, effectively created a judicial barrier that the legislative language of R.A. 8552 could not overcome. It established a form of "second-class" legitimacy for adopted children. They were legitimate in name and in their direct relationship with their adopters, but they were denied a fundamental right of succession—representation—that biological legitimate children possessed. This created a profound legal and social dissonance: an adopted child was considered a legitimate child "for all intents and purposes," yet was simultaneously treated as a legal stranger to their own adoptive grandparents, aunts,

and uncles. This contradiction, born from a judicial interpretation that prioritized the "personal relationship" aspect of adoption over the full integration of the child, set the stage for future legislative reform. The *Sayson* doctrine highlighted a deep-seated tension between the legal fiction of adoption and the traditional emphasis on blood relations in succession, a tension that R.A. 11642 would ultimately resolve in favor of the child.

Section D: The "Iron Curtain Rule" (Art. 992): The Conceptual Barrier Reinforcing the Adoptee's Isolation

The isolation of the adopted child from the adopter's relatives, as cemented by the *Sayson* doctrine, found a conceptual parallel in another controversial provision of the Civil Code: Article 992, commonly known as the **"Iron Curtain Rule"**.³²

Article 992 states: "An illegitimate child has no right to inherit *ab intestato* from the legitimate children and relatives of his father or mother; nor shall such children or relatives inherit in the same manner from the illegitimate child".³² This provision creates a legal barrier, or "iron curtain," that completely severs intestate successional ties between the legitimate and illegitimate lines of a family. The rationale, as explained in jurisprudence, was based on a presumption of antagonism and hostility between the two families.⁴⁵

While an adopted child is legally legitimate and not subject to Article 992, the underlying logic of the *Sayson* ruling created a similar effect. Just as the Iron Curtain Rule erects a firewall preventing inheritance between an illegitimate child and their legitimate grandparents, the *Sayson* doctrine erected a firewall preventing an adopted child from inheriting from their adoptive grandparents by representation. Both rules, though applicable to different classes of heirs, were rooted in a philosophy that limited the extension of family ties beyond a certain point—one based on legitimacy status, the other on the absence of a blood tie. This conceptual resonance reinforced the adopted child's legal isolation within their new family, a status that was fundamentally at odds with the modern, child-centric goal of providing a permanent and fully integrated family environment. This legal and philosophical incongruity became a compelling reason for legislative intervention.

Part III: The Revolution of R.A. 11642: The Domestic

Administrative Adoption and Alternative Child Care Act

Enacted on January 6, 2022, Republic Act No. 11642, the "Domestic Administrative Adoption and Alternative Child Care Act," represents the most significant evolution in Philippine adoption law to date.⁴⁶ While its most prominent feature is the shift of domestic adoption from a judicial to an administrative process under the newly created National Authority for Child Care (NACC), its substantive provisions on the legal status of the adoptee are truly revolutionary.⁴⁹ The law not only streamlines procedures but also fundamentally redefines the nature of the adoptive relationship, with profound consequences for the law on succession.

Section A: Legislative Intent: The "Best Interest of the Child" as the Guiding Philosophy

The legislative intent behind R.A. 11642 is explicitly articulated in its Declaration of Policies.⁴⁶ The law's primary objective is to make domestic adoption proceedings "simpler and inexpensive" and to "streamline services for alternative child care," all while being guided by the paramount consideration of the **"best interest of the child"**.⁴⁸ This guiding philosophy signals a decisive shift away from the historical, property-focused origins of succession law towards a modern, humane framework centered on child welfare and family integration.⁴⁵

The law aims to provide a child with a "permanent family" and ensure their full and harmonious development.⁴⁶ This objective of complete integration is the driving force behind the law's most transformative provisions. By seeking to eliminate all legal and social distinctions between an adopted child and a biological child, the legislature recognized that true family integration requires more than just a change in surname or direct inheritance rights from the adopter; it requires full membership in the larger family unit, with all the rights and relationships that such membership entails. The changes to successional rights in R.A. 11642 are, therefore, not merely incidental but are a deliberate and necessary component of fulfilling this child-centric legislative purpose.

Section B: Deconstructing Section 41: The Creation of "Extended Filiation" and Relatives by Law

The heart of the reform introduced by R.A. 11642 is found in Section 41, titled

"Legitimacy." This section begins by reiterating the principle from previous laws: "The adoptee shall be considered the legitimate child of the adopter for all intents and purposes and as such is entitled to all the rights and obligations provided by law to legitimate children born to them without discrimination of any kind".⁶¹ However, it then adds a groundbreaking second paragraph that fundamentally alters the legal landscape:

"The legitimate filiation that is created between the adopter and the adoptee shall be extended to the adopter's parents, adopter's legitimate siblings, and legitimate descendants."⁶¹

This provision on **"extended filiation"** is the legislative masterstroke that resolves decades of legal ambiguity. By this "stroke of a legal fiat" ⁶⁵, the law no longer confines the adoptive relationship to the adopter and adoptee. It explicitly creates, by operation of law, a legal relationship between the adoptee and the adopter's immediate family. The adoptee is now, in the eyes of the law, the grandchild of the adoptive grandparents, the sibling of the adopter's other children, and the nephew or niece of the adopter's siblings.⁶⁵ The law has effectively created relatives by adoption, providing the adoptee not just with parents, but with a complete and legally recognized family.

Section C: The End of an Era: How Section 41 Statutorily Overturns the Sayson Doctrine

The enactment of Section 41 of R.A. 11642 directly confronts and statutorily overturns the long-standing jurisprudential doctrine established in *Sayson v. Court of Appeals*.⁶⁷ The very foundation of the *Sayson* ruling was the judicial pronouncement that "the relationship created by the adoption is between only the adopting parents and the adopted child and does not extend to the blood relatives of either party".¹⁴ Section 41 explicitly negates this premise by legislating the exact opposite: the filiation is now extended to the adopter's parents, siblings, and descendants.

By demolishing the legal firewall that *Sayson* had erected, Section 41 directly enables the right of representation for the adopted child. Since the adoptee is now legally the grandchild of the adopter's parents, the adoptee can "step into the shoes" of a predeceased adoptive parent and inherit from the adoptive grandparents' estate. The legal incapacity that prevented Delia and Edmundo Sayson from inheriting from their grandparents has been definitively removed by the legislature. This represents a clear instance where a legislative act has corrected a judicial interpretation that was

perceived as creating an inequitable distinction and falling short of the modern understanding of the "best interest of the child."

Section D: Full Legitimacy: How R.A. 11642 Cements the Adoptee's Status Outside the Ambit of the Iron Curtain Rule

The combined effect of the provisions in R.A. 11642 is the perfection of the adoptee's legal status as a legitimate child. By simultaneously declaring the adoptee to be a "legitimate child of the adopter for all intents and purposes" and extending this filiation to the adopter's entire family, the law leaves no room for ambiguity.⁶² The adoptee is now fully and unequivocally placed on the "legitimate" side of the family line for all legal matters, including succession.

This complete integration has a significant collateral effect: it ensures that the prohibitive "Iron Curtain Rule" under Article 992 of the Civil Code has absolutely no application to an adopted child's rights within their adoptive family.⁴¹ As a fully recognized legitimate member of the family, the adoptee can inherit from and be inherited by their adoptive grandparents, siblings, aunts, and uncles without any of the barriers that apply to illegitimate filiation. R.A. 11642, therefore, not only tears down the judicial barrier created by *Sayson* but also reinforces the adoptee's position far from the conceptual shadows of the Iron Curtain Rule, cementing their status as a true and equal member of the adoptive family.

Part IV: Synthesis and Application: The New Interplay of Rights

The legislative reforms introduced by R.A. 11642 have created a new legal reality for families with adopted members. The granting of "extended filiation" and the consequent right of representation directly reconfigures the established hierarchy of successional remedies. This section will synthesize these changes and provide practical illustrations to demonstrate the new interplay between representation and accretion, highlighting the diminished but still relevant role of the latter.

Section A: The New Hierarchy in Practice: Why Representation for Adoptees Now

Precludes Accretion in Most Cases

As established, the order of preference for filling a vacant share in an inheritance is substitution, followed by representation, and then accretion.¹² Before R.A. 11642, in a scenario where an adoptive parent, who was also an heir to their own parents' estate, predeceased their parents, the right of representation was unavailable to the adopted child due to the *Sayson* doctrine. Assuming the grandparents' will did not name a substitute, the law would bypass representation and proceed to the next remedy in the hierarchy: accretion. The share of the predeceased adoptive parent would therefore accrue to their co-heirs (i.e., their siblings).

R.A. 11642 has fundamentally altered this sequence. By granting the adopted child the right of representation, the law has "activated" a higher-order remedy. Now, in the same scenario, the law no longer needs to proceed to the level of accretion. The adopted child, as a legal representative, steps into the place of their deceased adoptive parent and inherits the corresponding share from the adoptive grandparents' estate.⁶⁴ The legal inquiry stops at representation, and accretion is precluded.

This shift significantly curtails the application of the right of accretion in estates involving adopted family members. It marks a critical change that estate planners, litigators, and legal scholars must recognize. The default mechanism of accretion, which once played a key role in these specific family structures, has now been largely superseded by the newly conferred right of representation.

Section B: Comparative Scenarios: Illustrating the Impact on Accretion

To provide a clear and practical understanding of this paradigm shift, the following table compares the successional outcomes for an adopted child under the previous legal framework (governed by the *Sayson* doctrine) and the current framework under R.A. 11642.

Factual Scenario	Outcome under Civil Code / Family Code (<i>Sayson</i> Doctrine)	Outcome under R.A. 11642		
Scenario 1: Inheritance from	Accretion Applies. The	accrues to his co-heir, the	Representation Applies;	The Adopted Child inherits

<p>Adoptive Grandparent</p> <p>Facts: Lolo (Grandfather) dies intestate, leaving an estate of PHP 10 million. Lolo's only legal heirs are his two children, Adopter-Father and Uncle. Adopter-Father predeceased Lolo. Adopter-Father is survived only by his legally Adopted Child.</p>	<p>Adopted Child cannot represent the Adopter-Father in the estate of Lolo, as the adoptive relationship does not extend to the grandparents.¹⁴ Since there is no representation, the share of the predeceased Adopter-Father (PHP 5 million)</p>	<p>Uncle, by right of accretion. The Uncle inherits the entire PHP 10 million estate. The Adopted Child receives nothing from Lolo's estate.</p>	<p>Accretion is Precluded. The Adopted Child, by virtue of the "extended filiation" under Section 41 of R.A. 11642, is now the legal grandchild of Lolo.⁶¹ The Adopted Child has the right of representation and can "step into the shoes" of the predeceased Adopter-Father.</p>	<p>the PHP 5 million share that would have gone to the Adopter-Father. The Uncle inherits his own PHP 5 million share. Accretion does not take place.</p>
<p>Scenario 2: Repudiation by a Co-Heir</p> <p>Facts: Testator dies, leaving a will that institutes his two biological children, A and B, and his adopted child, C, to the free portion of his estate pro indiviso in equal shares. Heir B validly repudiates his share.</p>	<p>Accretion Applies. The outcome is the same under both legal regimes. The right of representation does not apply in cases of repudiation (Art. 977, Civil Code).⁹ Since there is no substitution mentioned in the will and representation is not possible, the law proceeds to accretion. B's repudiated share accrues to the remaining</p>	<p>Accretion Applies. The outcome remains unchanged by R.A. 11642. The rule that an heir who repudiates cannot be represented is absolute and applies to all heirs, whether biological or adopted. Therefore, the remedy of representation is unavailable, and the law correctly proceeds to the next step in the hierarchy, which is accretion. B's</p>		

	co-heirs, A and C, in proportion to their original shares (Art. 1019). ²¹ A and C will share B's portion equally.	repudiated share will accrue to his co-heirs, A and C.
--	--	--

These scenarios starkly illustrate the new legal order. In cases of predecease or incapacity of an adopter-heir, R.A. 11642 has replaced accretion with representation as the governing principle. However, in cases of repudiation, accretion remains the operative rule, highlighting its narrowed but enduring relevance.

Section C: The Lingering Ambiguity and the Remaining Domain of Accretion

While R.A. 11642 is revolutionary, a point of sophisticated statutory construction has been raised concerning the interplay between two of its key sections.⁶⁷ Section 41 establishes "extended filiation," while Section 43 states that "in testate and intestate succession, the adopters and the adoptee shall have **reciprocal** rights of succession without distinction from legitimate filiations".⁶² The question arises whether the term "reciprocal" could be interpreted to mean that successional rights are exclusive only between the adopter and the adoptee, thereby negating the effects of extended filiation.

A purposive and child-centric interpretation, however, resolves this apparent tension. The term "reciprocal" should be understood to mean mutual, establishing that the adopter can inherit from the adoptee and vice-versa, just as a biological parent and child would.⁶⁷ It should not be construed as "exclusive," as such an interpretation would directly contradict the explicit language and clear legislative intent of Section 41, which extends filiation to the entire family. To interpret it as exclusive would be to defeat the law's primary objective of full integration and would resurrect the very inequities the statute was designed to abolish.⁶⁷ The "best interest of the child" doctrine, which permeates the entire Act, mandates an interpretation that gives full effect to the extended filiation.

Finally, it is crucial to reiterate that the right of accretion is not obsolete. Its domain has been significantly curtailed, but it remains fully operative in specific circumstances. The most prominent of these is **repudiation**. Article 977 of the Civil

Code is unequivocal: "Heirs who repudiate their share may not be represented".⁹ This rule applies to all heirs, including adoptive parents. Therefore, if an adoptive parent who is an heir to an estate validly repudiates their share, their adopted child cannot represent them. In such a case, with representation being legally impossible, the vacant share will accrue to the co-heirs under the rules of accretion.⁸ This underscores that while R.A. 11642 has reshaped the landscape, a complete understanding of the hierarchy of successional rights remains essential.

Part V: Conclusion and Recommendations

The enactment of Republic Act No. 11642 marks a watershed moment in Philippine family and succession law. It is more than a procedural reform; it is a profound declaration of social policy that completes the legal and familial integration of the adopted child. By resolving long-standing conflicts between legislative intent and judicial doctrine, the law has created a new, more equitable paradigm whose effects will be felt for generations.

Section A: Summary of Findings

This report has demonstrated that R.A. 11642, guided by the "best interest of the child," has fundamentally redefined the successional rights of an adopted child, with significant consequential effects on the application of the right of accretion. The central findings are as follows:

1. **Creation of Extended Filiation:** The cornerstone of the reform is Section 41, which creates "extended filiation" by operation of law. This provision extends the legal relationship of the adoptee to the adopter's parents, siblings, and descendants, effectively creating relatives by adoption.
2. **Statutory Overruling of the Sayson Doctrine:** By establishing extended filiation, R.A. 11642 explicitly and statutorily overturns the jurisprudential doctrine laid down in *Sayson v. Court of Appeals*. The legal basis for denying the right of representation to adopted children—that the adoptive relationship did not extend to the adopter's relatives—has been legislatively removed.
3. **Activation of Representation Precludes Accretion:** The law on succession operates on a strict hierarchy of remedies (Institution, Substitution, Representation, Accretion, Intestacy). By granting the adopted child the right of

representation, R.A. 11642 has activated a higher-order remedy. Consequently, in cases of predecease or incapacity of an adopter-heir, the law no longer proceeds to the lower-order remedy of accretion. The primary impact of the new law on accretion is, therefore, to significantly reduce its applicability in estates involving adopted family members.

4. **Enduring Relevance of Accretion:** The right of accretion is not obsolete. It remains the governing principle in cases of repudiation by an heir, as an heir who renounces their inheritance cannot be represented.

In essence, R.A. 11642 achieves the full legal integration of the adopted child, ensuring that for all intents and purposes, including succession, there is no longer any distinction between an adopted child and a biological one within the family structure.

Section B: Recommendations for the Legal Profession, Academe, and Estate Planners

The paradigm shift ushered in by R.A. 11642 necessitates a corresponding shift in legal practice, academic instruction, and financial planning.

- **For Legal Practitioners and Estate Planners:** It is imperative to advise clients that the *Sayson* doctrine and the old rules limiting an adoptee's successional rights are no longer good law. Estate plans, wills, and trusts drafted under the old legal framework must be reviewed and updated to reflect the new reality where adopted children can inherit by representation from their adoptive grandparents and other relatives. Failure to do so may lead to erroneous estate distributions and potential litigation.
- **For the Academe:** Law schools and bar review centers must immediately update their curricula, syllabi, and review materials for Civil Law, particularly in Wills and Succession. Textbooks and commentaries need to be revised to reflect that R.A. 11642 has statutorily superseded the *Sayson* ruling. The new interplay between representation and accretion for adopted children must be taught as the current and prevailing law.
- **For the Judiciary:** Courts must consistently apply the provisions of R.A. 11642 to give full effect to the legislative intent. Future decisions should cement the understanding that the adoptee is a full member of the adoptive family, entitled to all rights and privileges thereof, thereby ensuring that the legal fiction of adoption

aligns perfectly with the social reality of family.

Section C: Concluding Remarks

Republic Act No. 11642 should be recognized not merely as a law that simplified adoption procedures but as a landmark social justice statute. It represents the culmination of a decades-long evolution toward recognizing the dignity and rights of the adopted child. By finally resolving the dissonance between an adoptee's status as a "legitimate child" and the denial of the full rights of legitimacy, the law has brought coherence, equity, and compassion to a vital area of family law. It ensures that when the law speaks of family, the adopted child is no longer at the periphery but stands firmly and equally within its embrace, truly fulfilling the promise that there is, at last, no more distinction.

Sources cited

1. Validity of Devise to Non-Relative Versus Heirs' Claims Under Philippine Succession Law, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/validity-of-devise-to-non-relative-versus-heirs-claims-under-philippine-succession-law>
2. Inheritance Shares for Surviving Spouse and Children - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inheritance-shares-for-surviving-spouse-and-children>
3. Inheritance Rights of Children in Family-Owned Property - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inheritance-rights-of-children-in-family-owned-property>
4. Succession Rights of Unmarried Child to Parental Property Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/succession-rights-of-unmarried-child-to-parental-property-philippines>
5. Inheritance Rights for Half-Siblings - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inheritance-rights-for-half-siblings>
6. Inheritance and Succession Rights - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inheritance-and-succession-rights>
7. Right of Accretion | PDF | Will And Testament | Inheritance - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/presentation/330626837/Right-of-Accretion>
8. Accretion | PDF | Will And Testament | Inheritance - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/presentation/365520019/Accretion>
9. Intestate Succession | PDF | Intestacy | Inheritance - Scribd, accessed June 17,

- 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/465458302/Intestate-Succession>
10. Requisites and limitations — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Requisites+and+limitations>
 11. Substitution Right of Accretion - Inheritance in Spain, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://inheritancespain.com/substitution-accretion/>
 12. Requisites and limitations | Right of Accretion in intestate and testate ..., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/wills-and-succession/provisions-common-to-testate-and-intestate-succession/right-of-accretion-in-intestate-and-testate-succession/requisites-and-limitations>
 13. The substitution and the right of accretion - Inheritance Spain, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://inheritancespain.com/the-substitution-and-the-right-of-accretion/>
 14. Sayson Vs Honorable Court of Appeals | PDF | Intestacy | Private Law - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/394721945/Sayson-vs-honorable-court-of-appeals-docx>
 15. Inquiry Regarding Inheritance Rights of the Children of a Deceased Sibling - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inquiry-regarding-inheritance-rights-of-the-children-of-a-deceased-sibling>
 16. INHERITANCE RIGHTS AND THE STEP-PARTNER ADOPTION PARADIGM: SHADES OF THE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST ILLEGITIMATE CHILDREN - Hofstra Law, accessed June 17, 2025, https://law.hofstra.edu/pdf/academics/journals/lawreview/lrv_issues_v34n02_cc1_article-wendel_final.pdf
 17. Recognition of Foreign Divorce in the Philippines - Anarna Rosario-Guinto & Partners Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://arblaw.ph/article?tab=tab33&title=Recognition+of+Foreign+Divorce+in+the+Philippines>
 18. ABCs of Civil Law - Barrista Solutions, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.barristasolutions.com/post/abcs-of-civil-law>
 19. Legal or intestate succession, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://legalresource.ph/legal-or-intestate-succession/>
 20. Right of Accretion in intestate and testate succession | Provisions Common to Testate and Intestate Succession | WILLS AND SUCCESSION - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/wills-and-succession/provisions-common-to-testate-and-intestate-succession/right-of-accretion-in-intestate-and-testate-succession>
 21. BOOK III (FULL TEXT) : CIVIL CODE OF THE PHILIPPINES : CHAN ..., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://chanrobes.com/civilcodeofthephilippinesbook3.htm>
 22. Right of Accretion in intestate and testate succession — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Right+of+Accretion+in+intestate+and+testate+succession>

23. Accretion Notes | PDF | Will And Testament | Inheritance - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/678338969/Accretion-notes>
24. eCodal - VOL III Wills and Succession, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://sites.google.com/view/e-codal/civil/civil-code/vol-iii-wills-and-succession>
25. SECTION 1. Right of Accretion | PDF | Will And Testament | Intestacy - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/462937652/Wills-Reviewer>
26. Inheritance Rights of Adopted Children Under the Old Civil Code, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/inheritance-rights-of-adopted-children-under-the-old-civil-code>
27. Supreme Court Rulings on Adopted Child Inheritance Under Old Civil Code Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/supreme-court-rulings-on-adopted-child-inheritance-under-old-civil-code-philippines>
28. Title VII – Adoption (Family Code) - Law Library - Legal Resource PH, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://library.legalresource.ph/title-vii-adoption-family-code/>
29. Family Code Title VII Adoption, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://familymatters.netlify.app/family%20code/fc%20title%20vii%20adoption>
30. A Comprehensive Guide to Child Adoption Under Philippine Law - respicio & co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/dear-attorney/a-comprehensive-guide-to-child-adoption-under-philippine-law>
31. Succession Rights of a Non-Adopted Child in the Philippines - respicio & co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/succession-rights-of-a-non-adopted-child-in-the-philippines>
32. Rights of Illegitimate Children under the Philippine Family Code - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/rights-of-illegitimate-children-under-the-philippine-family-code>
33. Inheritance Rights of an Adopted Child Under Pre-Family Code Laws - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inheritance-rights-of-an-adopted-child-under-pre-family-code-laws>
34. Republic Act No. 8552 - LawPhil, accessed June 17, 2025, https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra1998/ra_8552_1998.html
35. Law Summary: DOMESTIC ADOPTION ACT OF 1998 - Republic Act No. 8552 - Digest PH, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.digest.ph/laws/domestic-adoption-act-of-1998?tab=summary>
36. G.R. No. 89224-25 - Sayson vs. Court of Appeals - Jur.ph, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/summary/sayson-v-court-of-appeals>
37. Case Digest: G.R. No. 89224-25 - Sayson vs. Court of Appeals - Jur.ph, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/digest/sayson-v-court-of-appeals>
38. Case Digest: G.R. Nos. 89224-25 - January 23, 1992 - Sayson vs. Ca, accessed

- June 17, 2025, <https://www.digest.ph/decisions/sayson-vs-ca-1?tab=digests>
39. Sayson Vs CA | PDF | Intestacy | Inheritance - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/347166406/Sayson-vs-CA>
 40. G.R. Nos. 89224-25 - LawPhil, accessed June 17, 2025, https://lawphil.net/judjuris/juri1992/jan1992/gr_89224_25_1992.html
 41. Inheritance Rights of Legitimate and Illegitimate Children, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/inheritance-rights-of-legitimate-and-illegitimate-children>
 42. Legitimacy and Inheritance Rights for Children in the Philippines - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/legitimacy-and-inheritance-rights-for-children-in-the-philippines>
 43. Inheritance Claims of Illegitimate Child from Deceased Parent in the Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/inheritance-claims-of-illegitimate-child-from-deceased-parent-in-the-philippines>
 44. Rights of Illegitimate Child Under Philippine Law - Respicio & Co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/rights-of-illegitimate-child-under-philippine-law>
 45. SC Revisits 'Iron Curtain Rule' in Succession Law, Upholds Best Interest of the Child – Supreme Court of the Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/sc-revisits-iron-curtain-rule-in-succession-law-upholds-best-interest-of-the-child/>
 46. IRR REPUBLIC ACT NO. 11642 - IMPLEMENTING RULES AND REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING RULES AND REGULATIONS OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 11642, THE DOMESTIC ADMINISTRATIVE ADOPTION AND ALTERNATIVE CHILD CARE ACT - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/96120>
 47. Domestic Administrative Adoption and Alternative Child Care Act, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://apwmanila2022.law.upd.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/Republic-Act-No.-11642-Domestic-Administrative-Adoption-and-Alternative-Child-Care-Act.pdf>
 48. Republic Act No. 11642 - LawPhil, accessed June 17, 2025, https://lawphil.net/statutes/repacts/ra2022/ra_11642_2022.html
 49. Implementing Rules of RA 11642 Adoption Act - Jur.ph, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://jur.ph/law/summary/implementing-rules-and-regulations-irr-of-republic-act-no-11642-r-a-no-11642>
 50. SC Issues Revised Domestic Adoption Guidelines - Supreme Court of the Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://sc.judiciary.gov.ph/sc-issues-revised-domestic-adoption-guidelines/>
 51. Background of ICAB | National Authority for Child Care, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.nacc.gov.ph/background-of-icab/>
 52. Domestic Adoption - SAKLAW, accessed June 17, 2025,

- <https://saklawph.com/domestic-adoption/>
53. IRR REPUBLIC ACT NO. 11642 - IMPLEMENTING RULES AND REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING RULES AND REGULATIONS OF REPUBLIC ACT NO. 11642, THE DOMESTIC ADMINISTRATIVE ADOPTION AND ALTERNATIVE CHILD CARE ACT - PHILIPPINE LAWS, STATUTES and CODES, accessed June 17, 2025, https://laws.chanrobles.com/republicacts/117_republicacts.php?id=11412
 54. REPUBLIC ACT NO. 11642 - AN ACT STRENGTHENING ..., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/2/94036>
 55. IRR of RA 11642 | PDF | Adoption | Legal Guardian - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/604580114/IRR-of-RA-11642>
 56. Understanding Inheritance Rights for Minor Children in Complex Stepfamily Situations in the Philippines - respicio & co., accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/understanding-inheritance-rights-for-minor-children-in-complex-stepfamily-situations-in-the-philippines>
 57. Inheritance Rights of Grandchildren in the Philippines - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/inheritance-rights-of-grandchildren-in-the-philippines>
 58. The Best Interests of the Child and Parental Authority in Philippine Family Law - Archium Ateneo, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://archium.ateneo.edu/ateneo-school-of-law-pubs/48/>
 59. Administrative Adoption | PDF - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/661798298/Administrative-Adoption>
 60. Legally Adopt a Child in the Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://duranschulze.com/legally-adopt-a-child-in-the-philippines/>
 61. I'm legally adopted. Who is/are my heir/s? : r/LawPH - Reddit, accessed June 17, 2025, https://www.reddit.com/r/LawPH/comments/1izghos/im_legally_adopted_who_is_arent_my_heirs/
 62. Can an Adopted Child Inherit from his Adoptive Parents? - Law Firm in Philippines, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://ndvlaw.com/can-an-adopted-child-inherit-from-his-adoptive-parents/>
 63. Paternity and Filiation — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Paternity+and+Filiation>
 64. Understanding the Extension of Legitimate Filiation to the Adopter's Parents Under RA 11642 - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/dear-attorney/understanding-the-extension-of-legitimate-filiation-to-the-adopters-parents-under-ra-11642>
 65. Philippines - Relatives By Adoption: Breaking Exclusivity Rule (1). - Conventus Law, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://conventuslaw.com/report/philippines-relatives-by-adoption-breaking-exclusivity-rule-1/>
 66. Relatives by adoption: Breaking exclusivity rule (1) - DivinaLaw, accessed June 17, 2025, <https://www.divinalaw.com/dose-of-law/relatives-by-adoption-breaking-exclusivity-rule-1/>

[ty-rule-1/](#)

67. Philippines - Revisiting Successional Rights Of The Adoptee. - Conventus Law, accessed June 17, 2025,
<https://conventuslaw.com/report/philippines-revisiting-successional-rights-of-the-adoptee/>
68. Effects of Adoption | Adopted Children - R.A. No. 11642 or the Domestic Administrative Adoption and Alternative Child Care Act | Paternity and Filiation | Marriage | FAMILY CODE, accessed June 17, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/paternity-and-filiation/adopted-children-ra-no-11642-or-the-domestic-administrative-adoption-and-alternative-child-care-act/effects-of-adoption>
69. Sayson V CA, GR 89224-25, January 23, 1992 | PDF - Scribd, accessed June 17, 2025,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/666321169/82-Sayson-v-CA-GR-89224-25-January-23-1992>