

## Republic of the Philippines Supreme Court Manila

NEWE COURT OF THE PHILIPP

(0)000

## FIRST DIVISION

## NOTICE

Sirs/Mesdames:

Please take notice that the Court, First Division, issued a Resolution

dated June 15, 2015 which reads as follows:

"G. R. No. 213132 (Dave Ybanez, Adame Ybanez, Marilyn Baldon, Victor Jariolne, Teodola Jariolne, et al. v. Ricardo Maandig). – Before us is a Motion for Reconsideration<sup>1</sup> of the Resolution<sup>2</sup> of this Court dated 22 October 2014, which denied the Petition for Review on Certiorari<sup>3</sup> of the Court of Appeals (CA) Decision and Resolution dated 05 December 2013 and 19 June 2014, respectively, in CA-G.R. CV No. 01514-MIN. The Court cited the late filing of the Petition and the fact that it only raised factual issues as bases for its denial.

Petitioners-appellants presented no substantial argument to warrant a reversal or modification of the Resolution. They failed to provide valid grounds for allowing the late filing of the Petition other than the liberal application of the rules. They also merely reiterated their arguments in the dismissed Petition, which involved only questions of fact.

It bears stressing that only questions of law may be raised in a Rule 45 petition, as the Court is not a trier of facts. <sup>4</sup> In consonance with this rule, the CA's factual findings are deemed conclusive on the parties and are not reviewable by this Court. These findings carry even more weight when the CA affirms the factual findings of the trial court, <sup>5</sup> as in this case. While there are exceptions<sup>6</sup> to this rule, none of them applies to the case at bar.

- over - two (2) pages .....

45

<sup>5</sup> Goldenrod, Inc. v. Court of Appeals, 418 Phil 492-502 (2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> *Rollo*, pp. 92-103.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Id. at 86-87.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Under Rule 45 of the Rules of Court.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Manotok Realty, Inc. v CLT Realty Development Corp., G.R. Nos. 123346, 134385, and 148767, 29 November 2005.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See Cosmos Bottling Corp. v. Nagrama, Jr., 571 Phil 281-310 (2008).

WHEREFORE, in view of the foregoing, we DENY the Motion for Reconsideration with FINALITY. No further pleadings shall be entertained. Let Entry of Judgment be made in due course.

The petitioners' compliance with the Resolution dated October 22, 2014 submitting a copy of the petition for review on certiorari in CD is **NOTED.** 

SO ORDERED."

Very truly yours,

EDGARO. ARICHETA Division Clerk of Court & 6102 45

Atty. Emelie P. Bangot, Jr. Counsel for Petitioners Blk. 1, Lot 13, Xavier Heights Subd., Upper Balulang 9000 Cagayan de Oro City Court of Appeals (x) 9000 Cagayan de Oro City (CA-G.R. CV No. 01514-MIN)

LUCAGBO ROJAS GALEON and FERENAL-BORJA LAW OFFICE Counsel for Respondent Capistrano-Makahambus Sts. 9000 Cagayan de Oro City

The Hon. Presiding Judge Regional Trial Court, Br. 38 9000 Cagayan de Oro City (Civil Case No. 2005-216)

Public Information Office (x) Library Services (x) Supreme Court (For uploading pursuant to A.M. No. 12-7-1-SC)

Judgment Division (x) Supreme Court

 $\mathbf{SR}$ 

144.13