## ### Title:

The United States vs. Aguedo del Rosario et al.

### ### Facts:

The defendants, Aguedo del Rosario and others, were implicated in a case concerning the resurgence of the Katipunan society in December 1901, aiming for the forcible overthrow of the Government of the United States in the Philippine Islands. The Katipunan, initially established during the Philippine Revolution against Spanish rule, was purportedly reorganized by the defendants to resist American sovereignty, establish a Tagalog government across the archipelago, and mobilize an insurgent army. Their activities from December 1901 to post-May 1, 1902, involved planning and instigating rebellion.

On July 5, 1902, the defendants were arrested and subsequently tried and convicted for rebellion under section 3 of Act No. 292 of the Philippine Commission. The prosecution presented substantial documentary evidence and admissions from the defendants. Despite the defendants' argument that they could not be convicted due to their non-recognition of the U.S. government in the Philippines, neither the trial court nor the Supreme Court found this defense tenable.

The case proceeded to the Supreme Court following an appeal focused on the severity of the imposed sentence—a \$5000 fine and the maximum ten years of imprisonment. The appellate counsel contested the application of the penalty, suggesting it should adhere to the medium grade in the absence of aggravating circumstances, based on the Spanish Penal Code principles.

### ### Issues:

- 1. Whether the information filed was sufficient in charging the defendants with the crime of rebellion.
- 2. Whether the defendants' non-recognition of the U.S. government in the Philippines exempted them from conviction for rebellion.
- 3. The applicability of the Spanish Penal Code's grading system in determining the penalty under Act No. 292.
- 4. The eligibility of the defendants for amnesty under the proclamation of July 4, 1902.

# ### Court's Decision:

1. The Court found the information sufficiently detailed to charge the defendants with rebellion, noting its adherence to the statutory definition and the lack of objection from the

## defendants.

- 2. The defendants' argument of non-recognition of U.S. sovereignty was dismissed as unfounded, underlining the government's right to uphold its authority.
- 3. It was ruled that the Spanish Penal Code's grading principles were inapplicable to penal legislations by the Commission, as these principles were part of a distinct system and foreign to the spirit of American criminal law.
- 4. The amnesty proclamation of July 4, 1902, did not apply to the defendants since their crime was committed post-May 1, 2002.

### ### Doctrine:

The principle articulated in this case is the broad discretion of judges in imposing penalties under American law, highlighting the independence of the Philippine-American legislative framework from the Spanish Penal Code's grading system.

## ### Class Notes:

- \*\*Rebellion under Act No. 292\*\*: Rebellion against the U.S. authority in the Philippine Islands includes inciting and organizing movements to overthrow the government.
- \*\*Sufficiency of Information\*\*: Identifying the crime and outlining actions falling under statutory definitions suffice legal charging, notwithstanding detailed factual enumeration.
- \*\*Applicability of Foreign Penal Codes\*\*: American criminal legislation practices, adopted in the Philippines, allow for judicial discretion in sentencing, diverging from the fixed grading systems, such as those in the Spanish Penal Code.
- \*\*Amnesty Proclamations\*\*: Conditions for amnesty must strictly comply with its terms, excluding acts committed outside its temporal scope.

# ### Historical Background:

The case emerges in the aftermath of the Philippine-American War and during the American colonial regime in the Philippines. The reorganization of the Katipunan by the defendants signifies continued resistance against foreign rule, now transferred from Spanish to American authorities. The ruling reflects the imposition of American legal principles over residual Spanish influences, in line with establishing U.S. sovereignty and control over the islands.