



REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES  
SUPREME COURT  
Manila

SECOND DIVISION

**NOTICE**

Sirs/Mesdames:

*Please take notice that the Court, Second Division, issued a Resolution dated **01 March 2021** which reads as follows:*

**“G.R. No. 254945 (Manuel Babasa, Miguel Vasquez, and Shirley Camposano Vasquez v. Anatalia C. Real, Michael C. Real, Rafaelito C. Real, Samuel C. Real, and Joseph Dennis C. Real,\* as Heirs of Ignacio C. Real).** – After a judicious study of the case, the Court resolves to **DENY** the instant petition<sup>1</sup> and **AFFIRM** the Resolutions dated January 21, 2020<sup>2</sup> and December 10, 2020<sup>3</sup> of the Court of Appeals (CA) in CA-G.R. SP No. 162978 for failure of petitioners Manuel Babasa, Miguel Vasquez, and Shirley Camposano Vasquez (petitioners) to sufficiently show that the CA committed any reversible error in dismissing their petition for review due to procedural deficiencies.

As aptly observed by the CA, petitioners failed to provide any explanation for their non-compliance with the rules.<sup>4</sup> To be sure, the relaxation of procedural rules cannot be made without any valid reasons proffered for or underpinning it. To merit liberality, petitioners must show reasonable cause justifying their non-compliance with the rules and must convince the Court that the outright dismissal of the petition would defeat the administration of substantive justice,<sup>5</sup> which petitioners failed to do. The relaxation of procedural rules in the interest of justice was never intended to be a license for erring litigants to violate the rules with impunity.<sup>6</sup> Petitioners urge a less rigid application of procedural rules to give way to the resolution of the case on its merits. However, the desired leniency cannot be accorded absent valid and compelling reasons for such a procedural lapse,<sup>7</sup> as in this case.

\* ‘Joseph S. Real’ in the title of the petition. *Rollo*, p. 16.

<sup>1</sup> See Petition for Review on *Certiorari* dated February 18, 2021; *id.* at 16-32.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 34-36. Penned by Associate Justice Ruben Reynaldo G. Roxas with Associate Justices Celia C. Librea-Leagogo and Eduardo B. Peralta, Jr., concurring.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 56-58.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 57.


<sup>5</sup> See Unsigned Resolution in *Rumohr v. Sani*, G.R. No. 242131, January 7, 2019, citing *Daikoku Electronics Phils., Inc. v. Raza*, 606 Phil. 796, 803 (2009).

<sup>6</sup> See Unsigned Resolution in *Tabique v. Rural Transit [Mindanao], Inc.*, G.R. No. 215984, July 30, 2019.

<sup>7</sup> See *Daikoku Electronics Phils., Inc. v. Raza*, *supra*.

**SO ORDERED.** (Rosario, J., on leave.)”

By authority of the Court:

  
TERESITA AQUINO TUAZON  
Division Clerk of Court  
19 MAR 2021

LOPEZ RANCE ALDEA & ASSOCIATES (reg)  
Counsel for Petitioners  
Lot 7, Block 2, De Loreto Street  
San Antonio Valley 14 Sucat  
Parañaque City

ATTY. ROMEO N. JUAYNO, JR. (reg)  
Counsel for Respondents  
Suite 808, The Garden Heights Tower  
269 E. Rodriguez Sr. Avenue  
1100 New Manila, Quezon City

HON. PRESIDING JUDGE (reg)  
Regional Trial Court, Branch 198  
1740 Las Piñas City  
(Civil Case No. LP-19-0007)

JUDGMENT DIVISION (x)  
Supreme Court, Manila

PUBLIC INFORMATION OFFICE (x)  
LIBRARY SERVICES (x)  
[For uploading pursuant to A.M. No. 12-7-SC]

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ATTORNEY (x)  
OFFICE OF THE REPORTER (x)  
PHILIPPINE JUDICIAL ACADEMY (x)  
Supreme Court, Manila

COURT OF APPEALS (x)  
Ma. Orosa Street  
Ermita, 1000 Manila  
CA-G.R. SP No. 162978

*Please notify the Court of any change in your address.*  
GR254945. 3/01/2021A(176)URES