

An Analytical Exposition of Philippine Marital Property Regimes: A Deep Research Report Anchored on Cueno v. Bautista

Zepharian Valtrix

The author of this report is a **PhD researcher**, with extensive experience in authoring technical papers and contributing to legal journals. The analysis herein is presented with the rigor, depth, and precision characteristic of academic legal scholarship, intended for an audience of legal professionals, academics, and advanced students of law.

Executive Summary

This report provides an exhaustive analysis of the legal frameworks governing marital property in the Philippines, with the landmark Supreme Court *En Banc* decision in **Spouses Eulalio Cueno and Flora Bonifacio Cueno vs. Spouses Epifanio and Veronica Bautista, G.R. No. 246445 (March 2, 2021)**, serving as the central analytical anchor. The *Cueno* case definitively resolves a long-standing jurisprudential conflict regarding the legal status of a sale of conjugal property without spousal consent under the Civil Code of the Philippines (Republic Act No. 386), declaring such transactions to be **merely voidable, not void**. This ruling's significance lies in its harmonization of Articles 166 and 173 of the Civil Code, establishing that the non-consenting spouse had a ten-year prescriptive period from the date of the transaction to seek its annulment. The failure to do so within this period validates the

sale and secures the title of subsequent purchasers, thereby reinforcing the stability of the Torrens system.

The report traces the historical evolution of the rules on spousal consent, demonstrating a clear legislative trajectory reflective of societal progress towards gender equality. Under the Spanish Civil Code of 1889, the husband possessed absolute authority to dispose of conjugal property without the wife's consent. The New Civil Code of 1950 introduced a significant change, making such dispositions voidable at the instance of the wife. Finally, the Family Code of 1988 established the current standard of joint administration, rendering any disposition without the other spouse's consent unequivocally **void**, subject only to ratification as a "continuing offer."¹

A comprehensive comparative analysis of the three primary property regimes—the **Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG)**, the **Absolute Community of Property (ACP)**, and the **Complete Separation of Property (CSP)**—is presented. This analysis delineates the critical differences in their default applicability, composition, administration, disposition rules, and liquidation procedures. The report underscores how these regimes create distinct risk profiles for third parties, such as creditors and property buyers, and highlights the non-negotiable importance of due diligence in transactions involving married individuals. The mandatory procedures for the liquidation of the marital estate upon dissolution, particularly by death, are also examined, emphasizing their role in protecting the rights of heirs and creditors against unilateral acts by a surviving spouse.

Finally, the report offers a predictive analysis for the 2025 Philippine Bar Examinations in Civil Law. Based on the official syllabus and recent jurisprudential trends, it identifies the doctrines established in *Cueno v. Bautista*, *Tan-Andal v. Andal* (on psychological incapacity), and *Republic v. Manalo* (on foreign divorce) as high-yield topics. It posits that bar questions will increasingly favor complex, integrated

¹ logseq://graph/OBSIDIAN?block-id=630075ac-23a0-4926-8967-aaa6c22174f1

scenarios that test a candidate's ability to synthesize principles from Property, Family Law, and Succession, rewarding not just rote memorization but a nuanced understanding of the policy considerations underpinning these landmark rulings.

Part I: Deconstruction of G.R. No. 246445 (Spouses Cueno vs. Spouses Bautista)

The 2021 *En Banc* decision of the Philippine Supreme Court in *Spouses Eulalio Cueno and Flora Bonifacio Cueno vs. Spouses Epifanio and Veronica Bautista* stands as a cornerstone in modern jurisprudence on property relations. It resolved decades of conflicting judicial interpretations and provided much-needed stability to countless real property titles. A thorough deconstruction of this case is essential to understanding the legal landscape of marital property disposition under the Civil Code.

Section 1.1: Factual Antecedents and Procedural History

The case revolved around a protracted dispute over a parcel of land, Lot No. 2836, located in Zamboanga City. The timeline of transactions and litigation is critical to appreciating the legal issues at play.¹

Detailed Narrative of Transactions

The property's journey began with its co-ownership by two brothers, Luis Bonifacio and Isidro Bonifacio.¹ The key transactions that led to the dispute were as follows:

1. **First Sale (October 23, 1961):** The petitioners, Spouses Eulalio Cueno and Flora

Bonifacio Cueno, acquired the *pro indiviso* (undivided) share of Isidro Bonifacio in the subject property. This transaction was memorialized in an *Escritura de Venta*.¹ As this property was acquired during their marriage, it formed part of their conjugal partnership.

2. **Second Sale (December 4, 1963):** This is the pivotal transaction in the case. Eulalio Cueno, petitioner-husband, allegedly sold the conjugal share of the spouses to his father-in-law, Luis Bonifacio (Flora's own father). Crucially, this sale was executed **without the consent of his wife, Flora**.¹ This second sale was also documented through an *Escritura de Venta*.
3. **Issuance and Cancellation of Titles (1967):** On April 13, 1967, Transfer Certificate of Title (TCT) No. T-20,676 was issued in the names of Luis Bonifacio and Eulalio Cueno, reflecting their co-ownership based on the first sale. However, on the very same day, the second sale (from Eulalio to Luis) was registered. This led to the immediate cancellation of TCT No. T-20,676 and the issuance of a new title, TCT No. T-20,677, solely in the name of "Luis Bonifacio, married to Juana Toribio".¹
4. **Third Sale (August 12, 1977):** Luis Bonifacio sold the entire property to the respondents, Spouses Epifanio and Veronica Bautista. Consequently, TCT No. T-20,677 was cancelled, and TCT No. T-49,239 was issued in the name of the Spouses Bautista.¹
5. **Subsequent Acts by the Bautistas:** Following their purchase, the Spouses Bautista took possession of the property, introduced improvements, and on October 14, 2005, donated the land to their four children, who were then issued new TCTs in their respective names.¹
6. **Commencement of Litigation (November 10, 2008):** Decades after the contentious second sale, the Spouses Cueno filed a complaint for recovery of

their share in the property. They alleged that they had been deprived of their property through fraud and that the second sale was invalid due to the lack of Flora's spousal consent.¹

Journey Through the Courts

The case traversed the judicial hierarchy, with each level rendering a starkly different conclusion:

- **Regional Trial Court (RTC) Ruling:** The RTC of Zamboanga City ruled in favor of the petitioners, the Spouses Cueno. It declared the second sale of 1963 **void ab initio**. The basis for this nullity was not proven fraud or forgery, but the explicit lack of Flora's consent, which the RTC deemed a fatal defect. As a consequence of the second sale being void, the RTC held that all subsequent titles, including the one held by the Bautistas, were also void. It concluded that an action to declare the nullity of a void contract is imprescriptible.²
- **Court of Appeals (CA) Ruling:** The Court of Appeals reversed the RTC's decision and dismissed the Cuenos' complaint. The CA's reasoning, however, sidestepped a direct ruling on the validity of the second sale. Instead, it focused on the status of the Spouses Bautista as **innocent purchasers for value**. The CA held that the Bautistas had the right to rely on the face of the Torrens certificate of title, which was clean and registered in the name of their seller, Luis Bonifacio. This reliance, according to the CA, gave them a better right to the property.¹

Section 1.2: The Core Legal Contention: Void vs. Voidable Contracts

The conflicting rulings of the RTC and the CA brought the central legal issue into sharp focus before the Supreme Court. The resolution of the case hinged on determining the precise legal character of a contract of sale of conjugal property

executed by a husband without his wife's consent under the regime of the New Civil Code.

- **Petitioners' Position:** The Spouses Cueno anchored their claim on the theory that the 1963 sale was **void**. They argued that Article 166 of the Civil Code, which prohibits the husband from alienating conjugal real property without the wife's consent, is a mandatory provision. An act executed against a mandatory or prohibitory law is void under Article 5 of the Civil Code. If the contract was void from the beginning, it could not be ratified, and the right to seek a declaration of its nullity does not prescribe, as provided in Article 1410 of the Civil Code.¹ This would mean their 2008 complaint was filed on time.
- **The Two Conflicting Juridical Views:** The Supreme Court, in its decision, explicitly acknowledged that its own past rulings on the matter were not uniform. It identified two divergent lines of jurisprudence that had developed over the years ⁴].
 - **The "Void" Contract Theory:** One line of cases treated such sales as void *ab initio*. The rationale was either that the wife's consent was an indispensable element for the contract's validity or that the transaction directly contravened a mandatory provision of law, rendering it a nullity.
 - **The "Voidable" Contract Theory:** The opposing view held that such contracts were not void but merely **voidable**. This theory was primarily based on Article 173 of the Civil Code, which grants the wife a specific remedy—an action for annulment—and a specific timeframe—ten years—to exercise it. The existence of a specific remedy for annulment with a prescriptive period strongly suggested that the contract was not a complete nullity but was valid until set aside.

This jurisprudential schism created significant legal uncertainty, making the Supreme

Court's intervention in *Cueno* a matter of profound importance for Philippine property law.

Section 1.3: The Supreme Court's *En Banc* Ruling and *Ratio Decidendi*

To resolve the conflicting doctrines once and for all, the Supreme Court decided the *Cueno* case *En Banc*. The Court's ruling was unequivocal, systematically dismantling the "void" theory and solidifying the "voidable" theory as the correct and prevailing rule for transactions governed by the New Civil Code.

- **The Prevailing Rule: The Sale is Voidable:** The Court definitively held that a sale of conjugal real property by the husband without the wife's consent, as prohibited by Article 166 of the Civil Code, is **merely voidable** ³].
- **Harmonization of Civil Code Provisions:** The intellectual anchor of the decision is the Court's meticulous harmonization of Article 166 and Article 173 of the Civil Code.
 - **Article 166:** The husband cannot alienate or encumber any real property of the conjugal partnership without the wife's consent.²
 - **Article 173:** The wife may, during the marriage and within ten years from the transaction questioned, ask the courts for the annulment of any contract of the husband entered into without her consent....³

The Court reasoned that these two articles must be read together. The existence of Article 173, which explicitly provides for a remedy of "annulment" and sets a ten-year prescriptive period, is determinative of the nature of the defect. If the contract were absolutely void, there would be no need for a remedy of annulment, as a void contract produces no legal effect and its nullity is imprescriptible. The provision of a specific period to annul implies that the contract is valid and binding until it is set aside by a competent court upon the wife's timely action.

- **Nature of the Contractual Defect:** The Court further clarified the nature of the "lack of consent." It distinguished this from a total *absence* of consent, which is a characteristic of a void or inexistent contract. Instead, the lack of the wife's consent under Article 166 was classified as a **vitiating of consent**, analogous to the legal incapacity of one of the contracting parties under Article 1390 of the Civil Code ⁴]. Contracts where consent is vitiated are, by definition, voidable. They are valid and produce legal effects until they are annulled. They can be ratified, and the action to annul them is subject to prescription.
- **Application of the Prescriptive Period:** Applying this doctrine to the facts, the Court found that the Cuenos' claim was barred by prescription. The second sale was executed on December 4, 1963. Pursuant to Article 173, Flora Cueno's right to file an action for annulment accrued on that date. She had a ten-year window, or until December 4, 1973, to question the transaction in court.³ By filing their complaint only in 2008, more than four decades later, their right of action had long been extinguished. Consequently, the Spouses Cueno had no legal standing to question the validity of the 1963 sale or any of the subsequent transactions that stemmed from it, including the sale to the Spouses Bautista.

Section 1.4: Doctrinal Significance and the Abandonment of Contrary Rulings

The *Cueno* decision is not merely a resolution of a single property dispute; it is a landmark ruling that reshaped a significant area of civil law. Its doctrinal importance stems from several key aspects.

First, by sitting *En Banc* and explicitly stating that it was "**abandoning all cases contrary thereto**," the Supreme Court provided a definitive and authoritative resolution to a long-standing jurisprudential conflict.⁴ This act of judicial clarification is crucial for the rule of law, as it eliminates ambiguity and ensures that lower courts,

legal practitioners, and the public have a single, reliable standard to follow.

Second, the ruling provides immense **stability and predictability to the Torrens system of land registration**. The Philippines has countless properties with titles that trace their roots to sales made between 1950 and 1988 under the Civil Code. The "void" theory posed a constant threat to these titles, as it implied that a decades-old transaction could be challenged at any time, potentially unsettling chains of ownership and undermining the principle of indefeasibility of title. By establishing that these transactions were merely voidable and subject to a 10-year prescriptive period, *Cueno* effectively validates titles derived from such sales where the window for annulment has closed. This protects innocent purchasers for value, like the Spouses Bautista, who relied on a clean title, and fosters confidence in real estate transactions.

The logic of the Court reveals a fundamental principle of statutory construction: a specific provision governs over a general one. While the general rule in Article 5 of the Civil Code voids acts against mandatory laws, the highly specific remedy and prescriptive period provided in Article 173 for violations of Article 166 carves out a special category of voidable contracts. The existence of the remedy in Article 173 is the dispositive factor that defines the nature of the right and the defect in Article 166. Without Article 173, the petitioners' argument that the sale was void would have been much stronger. The remedy, therefore, illuminates the right.

This creates a clear demarcation between legal eras. Transactions governed by the Civil Code are subject to the "voidable" standard with its 10-year prescriptive period. In contrast, as will be discussed later, transactions under the Family Code are subject to the "void" standard, making them perpetually assailable unless ratified. This temporal stratification of rules is now a critical area of knowledge for any legal professional dealing with Philippine real property, as applying the wrong era's law can lead to a fundamentally flawed legal analysis and, potentially, professional liability.

Part II: The Historical and Legal Evolution of Marital Property Disposition

The rules governing a spouse's power to sell marital property are not static; they are a reflection of evolving societal norms, particularly concerning the role of women in a marriage and the concept of marriage itself as a partnership. The journey from the Spanish Civil Code to the current Family Code illustrates a profound legislative and jurisprudential shift from patriarchal dominance to spousal equality. The *Cueno* case is a pivotal marker in this evolutionary timeline.

Section 2.1: The Era of Absolute Husband's Prerogative: The Spanish Civil Code of 1889

Prior to the effectivity of the New Civil Code in 1950, property relations between spouses in the Philippines were governed by the Spanish Civil Code of 1889.⁷ This legal framework was a product of its time, deeply rooted in a patriarchal structure that vested almost absolute control over marital assets in the husband.

- **Legal Framework and the Husband's Power:** The default property regime was the conjugal partnership (*sociedad de gananciales*). Under this system, the husband was the sole administrator of the conjugal property.⁹ His authority was not merely managerial; it extended to acts of disposition.
- **Article 1413 of the Spanish Civil Code:** As the Supreme Court noted in its *Cueno* decision, this provision was the linchpin of the husband's power. It established that the husband's right to administer and dispose of conjugal property was "**full, absolute and complete.**" Consequently, the wife's consent for the sale or

encumbrance of conjugal property was **not required** ^{2]}. Any sale made by the husband, even without his wife's knowledge or approval, was considered perfectly valid and binding.

- **Historical and Societal Context:** This legal rule mirrored the societal view of the husband as the undisputed head of the family, with the wife's role being subordinate.⁹ The law did not conceive of marriage as a partnership of equals in the economic sense. The wife had very limited capacity to enter into contracts or manage property independently. This era represents the baseline from which all subsequent legal reforms on spousal property rights would depart.

Section 2.2: The Dawn of Spousal Protection: The New Civil Code of 1950

The enactment of the New Civil Code of the Philippines (Republic Act No. 386) on August 30, 1950, heralded a monumental shift in the legal status of married women with respect to property. It moved away from the absolute authority of the husband and introduced a new layer of protection for the wife.

- **The Shift to a Voidable Framework:** The New Civil Code retained the conjugal partnership of gains as the default regime but fundamentally altered the rules of administration and disposition. Articles 165 and 166 designated the husband as the administrator but curtailed his absolute power. Specifically, **Article 166** mandated that the husband could not alienate or encumber any real property of the conjugal partnership without the wife's consent.⁷
- **The Cueno Doctrine as the Quintessential Example:** The *Cueno* case perfectly illustrates the mechanics of this new regime. The 1963 sale by Eulalio Cueno was not automatically valid as it would have been under the Spanish Civil Code, nor was it automatically void. Instead, the lack of Flora's consent rendered the contract **voidable**. This meant the contract was valid and effective unless and

until Flora took action to have it annulled.

- **The Nature of the Wife's Protection:** The protection granted by the New Civil Code was not absolute nullity but a specific, actionable right vested in the wife. **Article 173** provided her with the power to go to court and seek the annulment of the unauthorized transaction. However, this power was circumscribed by two critical limitations: it had to be exercised **during the marriage**, and it had to be done **within ten years** from the date of the transaction.³ This framework represents a crucial transitional phase in Philippine law. It recognized the wife's interest in the conjugal property and gave her a legal tool to protect it, but it placed the onus squarely on her to actively and timely assert that right. Failure to do so, as happened in the *Cueno* case, resulted in the loss of the right and the validation of the transaction by prescription.

Section 2.3: The Age of Joint Administration: The Family Code of 1988

The enactment of the Family Code of the Philippines (Executive Order No. 209), which took effect on August 3, 1988, marked the culmination of the legal evolution towards spousal equality in property relations. It replaced the husband-as-administrator model with a regime of full joint administration.

- **A Stricter, Co-Equal Regime:** The Family Code established the principle of joint administration and enjoyment for both the Absolute Community of Property (ACP) and the Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG).¹³ This is enshrined in **Article 96 (ACP)** and **Article 124 (CPG)**.
- **Disposition Without Consent is VOID:** The most significant change was the legal consequence of a disposition made without the consent of the other spouse. Both Articles 96 and 124 unequivocally state that such a transaction is **void**.² A void contract is a legal nullity from the very beginning; it produces no

effect, cannot be ratified in the traditional sense, and the action to declare its inexistence is imprescriptible.

- **The "Continuing Offer" Proviso:** While declaring the transaction void, the Family Code introduced a unique mechanism to potentially salvage it. The law construes the void transaction as a **"continuing offer"** on the part of the consenting spouse and the third party. This offer may be perfected into a binding contract if the non-consenting spouse later gives their acceptance or if the court grants authorization before the offer is withdrawn by either party.² This feature is a distinct innovation of the Family Code and has no counterpart in the voidable contract regime of the New Civil Code.

Section 2.4: Jurisprudential Cross-Currents: Reconciling *Cueno*, *Abalos*, and *Guiang*

For years, the differing outcomes in cases involving unauthorized sales of marital property created confusion. Cases like *Spouses Abalos v. Heirs of Gomez* ^{21]} and *Guiang v. Court of Appeals* ¹⁶ declared such sales **void**, which seemed to be in direct contradiction with other rulings that found them to be merely voidable. The *Cueno* decision provides the master key to reconciling this apparent conflict.

- **The Reconciling Principle: The Governing Law:** The crucial distinction lies in the **governing law at the time the transaction took place**.
 - The sale in ***Cueno v. Bautista*** occurred in **1963**. The marriage was governed by the **New Civil Code**. Therefore, the applicable provisions were Articles 166 and 173, which, as the Supreme Court clarified, render the contract **voidable**.
 - The sales in ***Guiang v. Court of Appeals*** and ***Spouses Abalos v. Heirs of Gomez*** were executed during the effectivity of the **Family Code**. Therefore, the applicable provisions were Articles 96 and 124, which explicitly render the

contract **void**.

This temporal distinction resolves the seeming conflict. The cases are not contradictory; they are correct applications of different laws to different factual timelines. The Supreme Court in *Cueno* did not overturn *Abalos* or *Guiang*; it simply clarified that the "voidable" rule applies exclusively to the Civil Code era, while the "void" rule applies to the Family Code era.

This historical stratification of legal rules has immense practical consequences. It mandates that any due diligence on a property title must include an inquiry into the date of marriage of the registered owners and the date of any intra-spousal or third-party transactions. Applying the Family Code's strict "void" standard to a sale that occurred in 1970 would be a significant legal error, just as it would be erroneous to apply the Civil Code's 10-year prescriptive period to a sale that occurred in 1990. This underscores how an understanding of legal history is not merely academic but is indispensable for the competent practice of property law in the Philippines.

Part III: A Comprehensive Comparative Analysis of Philippine Marital Property Regimes

Philippine law provides for a default property regime but allows future spouses the freedom to choose a different one through a prenuptial agreement, officially known as a marriage settlement. Understanding the nuances of each regime is critical, as they dictate how property is owned, managed, and divided throughout the marriage and upon its dissolution. The three primary regimes are the Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG), the Absolute Community of Property (ACP), and the Complete Separation of Property.

Section 3.1: The Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG)

The CPG was the default regime for marriages celebrated before the Family Code took effect on August 3, 1988. For marriages after this date, it applies only if expressly chosen by the spouses in a marriage settlement.¹³

Governing Principles

The core principle of the CPG is that each spouse retains individual ownership of the property they brought into the marriage (separate property). A partnership is formed only with respect to the "gains" or "profits" acquired during the marriage. The spouses place in a common fund the proceeds, products, fruits, and income from their separate properties, as well as property acquired through their joint or individual efforts or by chance during the marriage.¹⁴

Composition of the CPG

The CPG is composed of two distinct masses of property: exclusive property and conjugal property.

- **Exclusive Property of Each Spouse:**

1. Property brought into the marriage as his or her own (often referred to as capital of the husband or paraphernal property of the wife).¹³
2. Property acquired during the marriage by gratuitous title (e.g., inheritance or donation), unless the donor, testator, or grantor expressly provides that it shall form part of the conjugal partnership.¹³

3. Property acquired by right of redemption, barter, or exchange with other exclusive property.¹³
4. Property purchased with the exclusive money of the wife or of the husband.²⁹

- **Conjugal Partnership Property:**

1. Property acquired by onerous title during the marriage at the expense of the common fund, regardless of which spouse's name appears on the title.¹²
2. Property obtained from the labor, industry, work, or profession of either or both spouses.²²
3. The fruits (natural, industrial, or civil) due or received during the marriage from the common property, as well as the net fruits from the exclusive property of each spouse.²²
4. The share of either spouse in a hidden treasure discovered on the property of the other.
5. Property acquired by chance, such as winnings from gambling or betting. However, any losses therefrom are borne exclusively by the loser-spouse.²²
6. Livestock existing upon the dissolution of the partnership in excess of the number of each kind brought to the marriage by either spouse.²²

Administration and Disposition

Under the Family Code, which applies suppletorily to CPG regimes, administration and enjoyment belong to both spouses jointly.²² Any disposition or encumbrance of conjugal property requires the consent of the other spouse.¹⁹ As established in the historical analysis, the consequence of a lack of consent depends on the governing law: under the Civil Code, the act is voidable (*Cueno* doctrine); under the Family Code,

it is void.

Liquidation of the CPG

Upon dissolution of the marriage or the partnership, a systematic liquidation process must be followed.²⁹ The steps are outlined in Article 129 of the Family Code:

1. **Inventory:** An inventory is prepared, listing separately the conjugal properties and the exclusive properties of each spouse.²⁹
2. **Crediting Advances:** Amounts advanced by the partnership to pay for personal debts of a spouse are credited back to the partnership as an asset.²⁹
3. **Reimbursement:** Each spouse is reimbursed for the use of their exclusive funds to acquire conjugal property or for the value of exclusive property that became conjugal.²⁹
4. **Payment of Debts:** The debts and obligations of the conjugal partnership are paid out of the conjugal assets. If insufficient, the spouses are solidarily liable with their separate properties.²⁹
5. **Return of Exclusive Property:** The remainder of the exclusive properties is delivered to each spouse.²⁹
6. **Payment for Deterioration:** The value of lost or deteriorated movables belonging to either spouse but used for the family's benefit is paid from the conjugal funds.²⁹
7. **Division of Net Profits:** The net remainder of the conjugal partnership property constitutes the profits, which are divided equally between the spouses or their heirs, unless a different proportion was agreed upon in the marriage settlement.²⁹

8. **Delivery of Presumptive Legitimes:** The presumptive legitimes of common children are delivered upon partition.²⁹
9. **Adjudication of Family Home:** The conjugal dwelling is typically adjudicated to the spouse with whom the majority of the children choose to remain.²⁹

Section 3.2: The Absolute Community of Property (ACP)

The ACP is the default property regime for all marriages celebrated on or after August 3, 1988, unless the spouses execute a prenuptial agreement stipulating otherwise.¹³

Governing Principles

The ACP regime embodies a more profound sense of community. It creates a single mass of property by merging almost all assets owned by the spouses at the time of their marriage, as well as all property they acquire thereafter. Both spouses become co-owners of this entire mass.³⁸

Composition of the ACP

- **Community Property:**

1. All property owned by the spouses at the time of the celebration of the marriage.¹⁷
2. All property acquired thereafter, including income and fruits from both community and exclusive properties.¹⁷

- **Excluded Property (Exclusive Property):**

1. Property acquired during the marriage by gratuitous title (inheritance, donation), including its fruits and income, unless the donor, testator, or grantor expressly provides that it shall form part of the community property.¹³
2. Property for the personal and exclusive use of either spouse. However, jewelry is explicitly considered part of the community property.¹³
3. Property acquired before the marriage by either spouse who has legitimate descendants from a former marriage, as well as the fruits and income of such property. This is to protect the interests of children from a prior union.¹³

Administration and Disposition

Administration and enjoyment of the community property belong to both spouses jointly, as mandated by Article 96 of the Family Code.¹⁷ This principle of co-administration is absolute. Any disposition or encumbrance of community property by one spouse without the written consent of the other, or without court authority, is **void**.¹⁷ The transaction is treated as a "continuing offer" that can be perfected by the other spouse's subsequent acceptance before withdrawal.¹⁸

Liquidation of the ACP

The liquidation of the ACP upon its dissolution follows the procedure in Article 102 of the Family Code, which is similar to but simpler than the CPG liquidation.³⁶

1. **Inventory:** An inventory is prepared, listing the community property and the exclusive property of each spouse.³⁶
2. **Payment of Debts:** The debts and obligations of the absolute community are

paid out of its assets.³⁶

3. **Return of Exclusive Property:** The exclusive properties, if any, are delivered to their respective owners.³⁶
4. **Division of Net Assets:** The net remainder of the community property is divided equally between the spouses or their respective heirs, unless a different proportion was agreed upon or a valid waiver was made.³⁶
5. **Delivery of Presumptive Legitimes:** The presumptive legitimes of the common children are delivered.
6. **Adjudication of Family Home:** The family home is adjudicated according to the same rules as in the CPG.³⁶

Section 3.3: The Regime of Complete Separation of Property

This regime is not a default and can only be established through a prenuptial agreement or by a judicial decree during the marriage.¹³

Nature and Principles

Under this regime, each spouse maintains complete and independent ownership, administration, and enjoyment of their own separate estate, whether acquired before or during the marriage.²⁸ There is no common fund or shared pool of assets.

Administration and Disposition

Each spouse has full autonomy. They can dispose of or encumber their own property without the need for the other spouse's consent.⁴⁶ This regime provides the highest

degree of financial independence and protection from the other spouse's creditors.

Family Expenses and Liabilities

Despite the separation of assets, the spouses are not absolved of their mutual obligation to support the family. They are required to bear the family expenses in proportion to their income or, if insufficient, to the current market value of their separate properties. Their liability to creditors for family expenses is solidary.⁴⁸

Judicial Separation of Property

Even if spouses start their marriage under ACP or CPG, they can later transition to a complete separation of property regime through a judicial petition. This can be done voluntarily (with joint petition) or for sufficient cause by one spouse. Grounds for judicial separation include abandonment, failure to comply with marital obligations, loss of parental authority, or gross mismanagement of the common property by the other spouse.⁴⁴

Section 3.4: Property Regimes During and After Dissolution

The dissolution of the marriage marks the termination of the property regime. The primary causes of dissolution are the death of a spouse, a decree of legal separation, a decree of annulment or declaration of nullity of marriage, or a judicial separation of property.¹⁷

A critical aspect of dissolution, particularly by death, is the **mandatory liquidation** of the common property. The Family Code imposes strict timelines for this. Under Article 103 (for ACP), the surviving spouse has six months from the death of the other spouse to liquidate the community property. Under Article 130 (for CPG), the period is

one year.³¹ Failure to comply with this mandatory liquidation renders any subsequent disposition or encumbrance of the community/conjugal property by the surviving spouse **void**.³¹

This rule is not merely procedural; it is a substantive protection for the heirs of the deceased spouse and for creditors. It prevents the surviving spouse from unilaterally dissipating or alienating the decedent's share in the marital estate before a proper accounting and partition can be made. This legal requirement imposes a significant due diligence burden on any third party transacting with a widow or widower concerning property that was part of the dissolved marital community. A buyer who purchases such property without verifying that a proper and timely liquidation has occurred risks entering into a void contract and acquiring no valid title. This intersection of family law, property law, and the law on succession is a complex but crucial area of legal practice.

The choice of property regime, whether by default or by agreement, thus has far-reaching consequences that extend beyond the spouses themselves, affecting third-party creditors, purchasers, and the spouses' own heirs. The ACP, with its broader pool of common property, may expose a spouse to greater liability for the other's pre-marital debts if they benefited the family.⁵⁷ In contrast, the CPG offers more protection for separate assets. A buyer transacting with a person married under ACP faces a different risk landscape than one transacting with a person under CPG, as the presumption of what constitutes common property is much wider in the former.

Table 3.1: Comparative Matrix of Marital Property Regimes

To synthesize these distinctions, the following matrix provides an at-a-glance comparison of the three primary property regimes under Philippine law.

Parameter	Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG)	Absolute Community of Property (ACP)	Complete Separation of Property (CSP)
Default Applicability	Marriages before Aug. 3, 1988 (Civil Code)	Marriages on/after Aug. 3, 1988 (Family Code)	Only by agreement (prenup) or judicial decree
Commencement	At the celebration of marriage.	At the celebration of marriage.	As stipulated in agreement or upon finality of court decree.
What is Common Property?	Proceeds, fruits, and income from separate properties; property acquired through effort or chance during marriage.	All property owned at time of marriage and acquired thereafter.	None. Spouses may agree to co-own specific properties.
What is Exclusive Property?	Property brought to the marriage; acquired by gratuitous title; acquired by redemption/exchange with exclusive funds.	Property acquired by gratuitous title (unless specified otherwise); personal use items (except jewelry); property from prior marriage with descendants.	All property of each spouse is separate.
Administration	Jointly by both spouses (Family Code).	Jointly by both spouses.	Each spouse administers their own property.
Disposition w/o Consent	Voidable (if under Civil Code, per <i>Cueno</i>); Void (if	Void.	No consent needed. The owner-spouse can freely dispose.

	under Family Code).		
Liability for Debts	Conjugal property liable for debts benefiting the family. Personal debts are charged to separate property first.	Community property is liable for family-benefit debts. Ante-nuptial debts that redounded to family benefit are also liable.	Each spouse is liable for their own debts. Solidary liability for family expenses.
Liquidation Process	Inventory, pay debts, reimburse separate property, divide net gains equally.	Inventory, pay debts, return exclusive property, divide net community assets equally.	No common property to liquidate. Each spouse retains their own estate.

This matrix serves as a vital analytical tool, distilling complex codal provisions and jurisprudence into a clear, comparative format. It directly addresses the need for a comprehensive distinction between the regimes, enabling rapid issue-spotting and informed legal advice.

Part IV: Forecast for the 2025 Philippine Bar Examinations in Civil Law

An analysis of recent jurisprudential trends, coupled with the official syllabus released for the 2025 Philippine Bar Examinations, allows for an informed forecast of the likely focus areas in Civil Law. The Supreme Court's recent decisions demonstrate a clear pattern of settling long-standing doctrinal conflicts and modernizing legal principles, making these landmark cases prime material for examination questions.

Section 4.1: Analysis of the 2025 Civil Law Syllabus and Recent Trends

The 2025 Civil Law Bar Syllabus confirms a continued and heavy emphasis on core areas, particularly **Family Law** and **Property Law**, and the intricate ways in which they intersect with **Obligations and Contracts** and **Succession** ⁵⁸]. The syllabus is structured not just around definitions but around legal consequences, remedies, and the application of principles to complex factual scenarios.

Recent trends in the Bar Examinations show a marked shift away from purely definitional questions towards integrated, problem-based scenarios.⁵⁹ A single question may require a candidate to navigate through issues of property classification, contract validity, and prescription simultaneously. The emphasis is on analytical skill and the ability to apply the law to a given set of facts, rather than mere rote memorization. Furthermore, recent landmark jurisprudence is consistently a high-priority source for bar questions, as these cases represent the current state of the law as interpreted by the highest court.⁵⁹

Section 4.2: The *Cueno* Doctrine as a Probable Bar Examination Topic

The doctrine established in *Spouses Cueno v. Spouses Bautista* is an almost ideal subject for a Bar Examination question for several compelling reasons:

1. **It is a recent landmark *En Banc* ruling.** Bar examiners frequently draw from the most significant decisions promulgated in the years leading up to the exam.
2. **It settled a major conflict in jurisprudence.** Questions that test a candidate's awareness of a doctrinal shift are a classic method for distinguishing exceptional from average examinees.
3. **It is multi-disciplinary.** A problem based on *Cueno* inherently tests knowledge across multiple areas of the Civil Code:

- **Property Relations:** Identifying the applicable property regime (CPG under the Civil Code).
- **Contracts:** Distinguishing between void and voidable contracts.
- **Prescription:** Applying the specific prescriptive period for annulment of contracts.

Hypothetical Bar Question and Analysis

A plausible bar question modeled after the *Cueno* case could be framed as follows:

Question: Spouses H and W were married in 1980 without a marriage settlement. In 1985, H, needing funds for a personal business venture, sold a parcel of land belonging to the conjugal partnership to B without W's consent. B immediately took possession of the land and had the sale registered, obtaining a new title in his name. In 2024, W, while organizing old documents after H's death, discovered the 1985 deed of sale for the first time. She immediately filed a complaint to nullify the sale and recover the property from B, arguing that the sale was void from the beginning for lack of her consent. B raised the defenses of prescription and being a buyer in good faith. Rule on the case with reasons.

Expected Answer Analysis

A high-scoring answer would demonstrate a clear, logical, and well-supported legal analysis:

1. **Identify the Governing Law and Property Regime:** The first step is to establish that since the spouses were married in 1980 without a marriage settlement, their

property relations are governed by the **New Civil Code**, and the default regime is the **Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG)**. The land, being part of the conjugal partnership, could not be alienated by H without W's consent.

2. **State the Core Issue and Applicable Doctrine:** The core issue is whether the 1985 sale was void or merely voidable. The answer must cite the controlling doctrine from ***Spouses Cueno v. Spouses Bautista***.
3. **Apply the *Cueno* Doctrine:** The answer must state that, according to the *Cueno* case, a sale of conjugal real property by one spouse without the other's consent, when governed by the New Civil Code, is **merely voidable**. The lack of consent is a vice of consent that renders the contract annulable, not a complete absence of consent that would render it void.
4. **Apply the Rule on Prescription:** The answer must then connect this classification to the rules on prescription. Citing **Article 173 of the Civil Code**, the answer should state that the wife (W) had a specific period of **ten (10) years** from the date of the questioned transaction (1985) to file an action for annulment.
5. **Conclusion:** Since the sale took place in 1985, W had until 1995 to file her complaint. Her action, filed only in 2024, is clearly barred by prescription. Therefore, the complaint must be dismissed. The defense of B being a buyer in good faith becomes secondary, as the action itself is already time-barred.

Section 4.3: Other Potential Landmark Topics for the 2025 Bar

Beyond *Cueno*, several other areas are ripe for testing, reflecting the Supreme Court's recent efforts to clarify and modernize key aspects of Civil Law.

- **Psychological Incapacity (Article 36, Family Code):** The 2021 decision in ***Tan-Andal v. Andal*** is a watershed moment in Family Law.⁵⁸ It significantly

simplified the requirements for proving psychological incapacity, abandoning the strict

Molina guidelines. A bar question is highly likely to test the new standard, focusing on the three core elements: that the incapacity is **(a) a true psychological illness** diagnosed by a competent professional; **(b) grave enough** to disable the party from assuming essential marital obligations; and **(c) incurable** in the legal, not medical, sense. A key point to test would be the clarification that expert testimony, while important, is not indispensable and its conclusions are not binding on the court.

- **Foreign Divorce and Mixed Marriages (Article 26, Family Code):** The 2018 ruling in *Republic v. Manalo* remains a cornerstone topic.⁵⁸ It established that a Filipino spouse can petition for the recognition of a foreign divorce decree obtained by their alien spouse, thereby capacitating the Filipino to remarry. A potential question could involve a scenario where the Filipino spouse initiates the foreign divorce, testing the limits and nuances of the *Manalo* doctrine.
- **Succession and Mandatory Liquidation of Marital Property:** Complex problems that merge Succession with Property Law are perennial favorites. A scenario involving the death of a spouse, followed by the surviving spouse's failure to liquidate the community property within the period prescribed by **Articles 103 (ACP) or 130 (CPG)** of the Family Code, and a subsequent sale to a third party, is a high-yield topic. This tests not only the rules on liquidation but also the consequences of non-compliance (the subsequent sale being void), as affirmed in cases like *Sps. Treyes v. Larlar*.⁵⁶ Such a problem forces the candidate to integrate knowledge of property regimes, succession rights (legitimes), and the validity of contracts.
- **Digitalization and Contracts:** While not a landmark case, the increasing prevalence of digital transactions presents a novel area for examination. A

question could explore the validity of a contract of sale or a spousal consent given through electronic means (e.g., email, messaging apps), testing the candidate's ability to apply the traditional principles of Obligations and Contracts (offer, acceptance, consent) to modern technological contexts, in conjunction with the Electronic Commerce Act (R.A. 8792).

The overarching trend suggests that the 2025 Bar Examinations will reward examinees who can see the bigger picture. The recent landmark rulings in Civil Law are not isolated pronouncements; they are part of a broader judicial philosophy aimed at providing stability (*Cueno*), pragmatism (*Tan-Andal*), and fairness (*Manalo*) to complex human relations. A successful bar candidate will need to demonstrate not just knowledge of the black-letter law, but an understanding of the "why"—the policy considerations and the jurisprudential reasoning—that animates these doctrines. Preparation must therefore shift from siloed memorization to synthetic, principle-based understanding.

Conclusion

The legal framework governing marital property in the Philippines is a rich tapestry woven from historical context, legislative evolution, and profound jurisprudential pronouncements. The Supreme Court's decision in *Spouses Cueno v. Spouses Bautista* serves as a critical lodestar, providing definitive clarity on the voidable nature of unauthorized sales of conjugal property under the New Civil Code and, in doing so, securing the stability of countless property titles. This ruling, when viewed alongside the stricter "void" standard of the Family Code and the absolute authority of the husband under the Spanish Civil Code, illustrates a clear and progressive legal narrative toward recognizing marriage as a partnership of equals.

The detailed comparative analysis of the Absolute Community of Property, the Conjugal Partnership of Gains, and the Complete Separation of Property reveals that

each regime creates a unique ecosystem of rights, obligations, and risks, not only for the spouses but for all who transact with them. The intricate rules on administration, disposition, and mandatory liquidation underscore the principle that marital property is imbued with a strong public interest, requiring careful adherence to legal formalities to protect the family, heirs, and creditors.

For the legal scholar, the practitioner, and the aspiring lawyer, a deep, integrated understanding of these principles is indispensable. As the forecast for the 2025 Bar Examinations suggests, the future of legal assessment lies in testing the ability to synthesize these interconnected areas of Civil Law. The capacity to trace a legal issue from its historical roots, through its legislative iterations, and to its latest interpretation by the Supreme Court is the hallmark of true legal expertise. The journey through Philippine marital property law is, therefore, not just an academic exercise but a vital preparation for navigating the complex realities of civil and commercial life.

Sources cited

1. Case Digest: G.R. No. 246445 - Spouses Cueno vs. Spouses Bautista - Jur.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/digest/spouses-cueno-v-spouses-bautista>
2. Sps. Cueno v. Sps. Bautista | PDF | Annulment | Marriage - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/639426467/22-SPS-CUENO-V-SPS-BAUTISTA>
3. G.R. No. 246445 - Spouses Cueno vs. Spouses Bautista - Jur.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://jur.ph/jurisprudence/summary/spouses-cueno-v-spouses-bautista>
4. #44 GR 246445 Spouses Cueno v. Spouses Bautista | PDF ... - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://fr.scribd.com/document/712812230/44-GR-246445-Spouses-Cueno-v-Spouses-Bautista>
5. SPOUSES EULALIO CUENO AND FLORA BONIFACIO CUENO, PETITIONERS, VS.

SPOUSES EPIFANIO AND VERONICA BAUTISTA, SPOUSES RIZALDO AND ANACITA BAUTISTA, SPOUSES DIONILO AND MARY ROSE BAUTISTA, SPOUSES ROEL AND JESSIBEL B. SANSON, AND SPOUSES CALIXTO AND MERCEDITA B. FERNANDO, RESPONDENTS. D E C I S I O N - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/67306>

6. Family Law Archives - Page 24 of 219 - ASG Law, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.asglawpartners.com/category/family-law/page/24/>
7. R.A. No. 386 • Civil Code of the Philippines - The Corpus Juris, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://thecorpusjuris.com/legislative/republic-acts/ra-no-386.php>
8. Civil Code of the Philippines - Wikipedia, accessed June 18, 2025, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Code_of_the_Philippines
9. Protecting Women's Human Rights: A Case Study in the Philippines - Digital Commons @ American University Washington College of, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1172&context=hrbrief>
10. May the husband sell conjugal property without his wife's consent ..., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://dailyguardian.com.ph/may-the-husband-sell-conjugal-property-without-his-wifes-consent/>
11. THE PHILIPPINES COUNTRY BRIEF: PROPERTY RIGHTS AND LAND MARKETS, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/23074/philippinesbrief.pdf?sequence=1>
12. Civil Code Of The Philippines(2) - AMSLAW, accessed June 18, 2025, [https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/civil-law/civil-code-of-the-philippines\(2\)](https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/civil-law/civil-code-of-the-philippines(2))
13. Exclusive and Conjugal Property Rights in Inheritance - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/exclusive-and-conjugal-property-rig>

[hts-in-inheritance](#)

14. Yours, Mine, Ours: Marital Property Regimes of Domestic and ..., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.divinalaw.com/dose-of-law/mine-marital-property-regimes-domestic-international-marriages/>
15. How to Sell Conjugal Property When Spouse Is Abroad in the Philippines, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/how-to-sell-conjugal-property-when-spouse-is-abroad-in-the-philippines>
16. G.R. No. 256141 - BELINDA ALEXANDER, PETITIONER, VS ..., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/68502>
17. Understanding Absolute Community of Property under Philippine ..., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/understanding-absolute-community-of-property-under-philippine-law>
18. Understanding Absolute Community of Property - Salenga Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://philippinelawfirm.com/property/understanding-absolute-community-of-property/>
19. Conjugal Partnership of Gains Regime | Different Property Regimes | Property Relations Between the Spouses | Marriage | FAMILY CODE - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/property-relations-between-the-spouses/different-property-regimes/conjugal-partnership-of-gains-regime>
20. Selling Conjugal Property Without Spouse's Consent - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/selling-conjugal-property-without-spouse-consent>

21. Buying Property Without Spouse Consent - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/buying-property-without-spouse-consent>
22. The Family Code Of The Philippines(2) - AMSLAW, accessed June 18, 2025,
[https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/civil-law/the-family-code-of-the-philippines\(2\)](https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/civil-law/the-family-code-of-the-philippines(2))
23. Transfer of Conjugal Property Without Spousal Consent Philippines ..., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/transfer-of-conjugal-property-without-spousal-consent-philippines-1>
24. Land Title Marked Married and Conjugal Property Rules Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/land-title-marked-married-and-conjugal-property-rules-philippines>
25. Property Relations Between the Spouses | Marriage | FAMILY CODE - respicio & co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/property-relations-between-the-spouses>
26. www.respicio.ph, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/property-relations-between-the-spouses/different-property-regimes/conjugal-partnership-of-gains-regime#:~:text=Under%20Philippine%20law%2C%20the%20Conjugal,on%20August%203%2C%201988%2C%20under>
27. Conjugal Property: What You Need to Know, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://sadsadtamesislaw.com/conjugal-property-what-you-need-to-know/bits-of-law/>
28. Property Relations - Mamangun Law Office, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://mamangun.lawyer/faq/f/marriage-settlement-property-relations>
29. The Conjugal Partnership of Gains | PDF | Marriage | Partnership, accessed June

18, 2025,

<https://www.scribd.com/document/480172177/THE-CONJUGAL-PARTNERSHIP-OF-GAINS-docx>

30. Conjugal Property Philippines - Lawyers in the Philippines - FCB Law Office, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://lawyerphilippines.org/conjugal-property/>
31. Understanding Conjugal Partnership of Gains (CPG) - Salenga Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://philippinelawfirm.com/family/understanding-conjugal-partnership-of-gains-cpg/>
32. Conjugal Property in Philippine Law, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/conjugal-property-in-philippine-law>
33. Definition and Management of Conjugal Property in the Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/definition-and-management-of-conjugal-property-in-the-philippines>
34. Conjugal Property in the Philippines — Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/conjugal-property-in-the-philippines>
35. Understanding the Legal Dissolution of Conjugal Properties and Its Implications on Marriage and Inheritance in the Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/understanding-the-legal-dissolution-of-conjugal-properties-and-its-implications-on-marriage-and-inheritance-in-the-philippines>
36. ACP CPG Liquidation Procedure | PDF | Community Property ..., accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.scribd.com/document/336157962/ACP-CPG-Liquidation-Procedure>
37. Conjugal Property of Gains and Inheritance in the Philippines - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/conjugal-property-of-gains-and-inheritance>

[ce-in-the-philippines](#)

38. ABSOLUTE COMMUNITY OF PROPERTY IN THE PHILIPPINES: A COMPREHENSIVE GUIDE - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/absolute-community-of-property-in-the-philippines-a-comprehensive-guide>
39. www.lawyer-philippines.com, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/understanding-absolute-community-of-property-under-philippine-law#:~:text=Absolute%20Community%20of%20Property%20under%20Philippine%20law%20is%20a%20comprehensive.exception%20explicitly%20provided%20by%20law>.
40. Absolute Community of Property in the Philippines - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/absolute-community-of-property-in-the-philippines>
41. Is a Property Donated during Marriage to only One Spouse Considered Conjugal Property? - Law Firm in Philippines | Corporate, Business, Family, IP, IT, and Litigation, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://ndvlaw.com/is-a-property-donated-during-marriage-to-only-one-spouse-considered-conjugal-property/>
42. True love and the absolute community of property, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://propertyreport.ph/news-and-events/2024/02/02/32988/true-love-and-the-absolute-community-of-property/>
43. Absolute Community of Property Regime | Different Property Regimes | Property Relations Between the Spouses | Marriage | FAMILY CODE - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/property-relations-between-the-spouses/different-property-regimes/absolute-community-of-property-regime>
44. Understanding the Process of Separation of Conjugal Properties in the

- Philippines, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/dear-attorney/understanding-the-process-of-separation-of-conjugal-properties-in-the-philippines>
45. Different Property Regimes | Property Relations Between the ..., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/property-relations-between-the-spouses/different-property-regimes>
46. Complete Separation of Property Regime or Judicial Separation of Property — Bar - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/tag/Complete+Separation+of+Property+Regime+or+Judicial+Separation+of+Property>
47. Complete Separation of Property Regime or Judicial Separation of Property | Different Property Regimes | Property Relations Between the Spouses | Marriage | FAMILY CODE - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/bar/2025/civil-law/family-code/marriage/property-relations-between-the-spouses/different-property-regimes/complete-separation-of-property-regime-or-judicial-separation-of-property>
48. complete separation of property during marriage, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.alburolaw.com/complete-separation-of-property-during-marriage/>
49. Property Regimes | PDF | Marriage - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/177688070/Property-Regimes>
50. lawyerphilippines.org, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://lawyerphilippines.org/conjugal-property/#:~:text=In%20Complete%20Separation%20of%20Property,line%20with%20Philippine%20Inheritance%20Law.>
51. Judicial Separation of Property in the Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/judicial-separation-of-property-in-the-philippines>
52. Navigating Marital Property Rights, Separation, and Legal Options in the

- Philippines, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/navigating-marital-property-rights-separation-and-legal-options-in-the-philippines>
53. Judicial Separation of Property in the Philippines - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/judicial-separation-of-property-in-the-philippines-1>
54. Acp - Dissolution and Liquidation | PDF | Annulment | Marriage - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/392305783/Acp-Dissolution-and-Liquidation>
55. THE HEIRS OF PROTACIO GO, SR. AND MARTA BAROLA, NAMELY: LEONOR, SIMPLICIO, PROTACIO, JR., ANTONIO, BEVERLY ANN LORRAINNE, TITA, CONSOLACION, LEONORA AND ASUNCION, ALL SURNAMED GO, REPRESENTED BY LEONORA B. GO, PETITIONERS, VS. ESTER L. SERVACIO AND RITO B. GO, RESPONDENTS. D E C I S I O N - Supreme Court E-Library, accessed June 18, 2025, <https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/1/28525>
56. Rights of Deceased Spouse in Extrajudicial Partition - Respicio & Co. Law Firm, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.respicio.ph/commentaries/rights-of-deceased-spouse-in-extrajudicial-partition>
57. Civil Code Of The Philippines(3) - AMSLAW, accessed June 18, 2025,
[https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/civil-law/civil-code-of-the-philippines\(3\)](https://amslaw.ph/philippine-laws/civil-law/civil-code-of-the-philippines(3))
58. 2025 Civil Law Bar Syllabus | PDF - Scribd, accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.scribd.com/document/772792487/2025-Civil-Law-Bar-Syllabus>
59. Strategizing Your 2025 Philippine Bar Exam Review: Essential ..., accessed June 18, 2025,
<https://www.digest.ph/blog/strategizing-your-2025-philippine-bar-exam-review-essential-materials-and-techniques>
60. 2025 Bar Exam Review and One-on-One Tutorial Options - Respicio & Co.,

accessed June 18, 2025,

<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/2025-bar-exam-review-and-one-on-one-tutorial-options>

61. 2025 Bar Exam Preparation - Respicio & Co., accessed June 18, 2025,

<https://www.lawyer-philippines.com/articles/2025-bar-exam-preparation>