Title: Bastida vs. The City Council of Baguio

Facts:

F. Bastida, the petitioner, owned lots 8 and 9 in the City of Baguio, which housed a onestory wooden building. In February 1929, Bastida sought to convert this building into a skating rink. This application was denied by the respondents, specifically E. J. Halsema, Mayor and City Engineer of Baguio, insisting that in the commercial zone, a building purposed for a skating rink must be at least two stories high. Bastida then decided to upgrade the building to three stories—to house a skating rink, cinematograph, and boxing stadium. However, upon announcing intentions to utilize the second floor for cinematographic shows, the City Council of Baguio adopted Ordinance No. 332, detailing stringent construction requirements for such establishments, followed by Ordinance No. 334 regarding fire safety. Bastida's subsequent applications for a building permit and operation license were rejected based on these ordinances, propelling Bastida to this court through a petition for mandamus.

Issues:

- 1. The legality and validity of Ordinance No. 332 requiring buildings hosting cinematographic projections to be constructed of reinforced concrete and steel.
- 2. Possible discrimination and reasonableness of Ordinance No. 332.
- 3. The applicability of mandamus as a proper legal remedy in this case.

Court's Decision:

The Supreme Court, upon examining the provisions of the law and the powers granted to the City Council of Baguio, concluded that the council had the adequate authority to enact Ordinance No. 332 focusing on public safety from conflagrations. It highlighted the necessity of using fireproof materials in constructions purposed for mass gatherings, like theaters and cinematographs. The Court found the ordinance neither unreasonable nor discriminatory. It emphasized the unique risks associated with cinema and theater establishments compared to other assembly points like churches or schools.

Concerning the supposed discrimination by exempting existing establishments, the Court recognized the council's discretion in transitional policies for newly passed ordinances. It reasoned that allowing previously permitted establishments to operate under conditions before the ordinance does not significantly undermine the ordinance's intent of improving safety standards moving forward.

Finally, the Court dismissed the appeal to use mandamus as a remedy, indirectly suggesting that mandamus is not appropriate for matters involving the discretionary powers of issuing permits and licenses. However, this aspect was not fully explored, as the Court favored an outright dismissal based on the ordinance's validity.

Doctrine:

The case reaffirmed the scope and limits of municipal police power, especially concerning public safety regulations. It underscored that ordinances aiming to protect public safety, even when imposing strict construction standards, are within the legal bounds provided they are reasonable, non-discriminatory, and serve a public interest.

Class Notes:

- Police Power: The authority of states to regulate behavior and enforce order within their territory for the betterment of the health, safety, morals, and general welfare of their inhabitants.
- Mandamus: A judicial remedy in the form of an order from a court to any government subordinate court, corporation, or public authority to do some specific act which that body is obliged under law to do.
- Discrimination in Law: Any differential treatment that unfavorably affects individuals based on arbitrary distinctions.
- Fire Safety Regulations: Legal requirements intended to minimize the risks and damages from fires within public and private buildings.
- Principle of Reasonableness: A legal doctrine stating that laws and legal decisions must be fair and rational, conforming to common sense.

Historical Background:

This case provides insight into the regulatory challenges and urban development considerations during the early 20th century in the Philippines, particularly in emerging cities like Baguio. It underscores the balance between economic growth, through endeavors like cinematography and entertainment, and the imperative of public safety amid evolving urban landscapes.