

Title: **\*\*Republic of the Philippines vs. Sandiganbayan, Major General Josephus Q. Ramas and Elizabeth Dimaano\*\***

Facts:

The case stemmed from the efforts of the Presidential Commission on Good Government (PCGG), established by then-President Corazon C. Aquino through Executive Order No. 1 in the wake of the 1986 EDSA Revolution. The PCGG's mandate was to recover ill-gotten wealth accumulated by former President Ferdinand E. Marcos, his family, and associates. Subsequently, the PCGG created the AFP Anti-Graft Board to investigate reports of unexplained wealth among AFP personnel, leading to the investigation of Major General Josephus Q. Ramas.

On 3 March 1986, a raid on Elizabeth Dimaano's residence in Batangas resulted in the seizure of large sums of money and military equipment, among other items. Dimaano was purportedly Ramas's mistress. The AFP Board concluded that Ramas had amassed ill-gotten wealth and recommended the filing of forfeiture proceedings against him. Thus, the Republic, represented by the PCGG, filed a petition for forfeiture under RA No. 1379 against Ramas and later amended the complaint to include Dimaano.

Ramas and Dimaano contested the allegations, leading to a lengthy legal battle that culminated in the Sandiganbayan's dismissal of the complaint. The Sandiganbayan found the PCGG's action improper and ordered the return of the confiscated items to Dimaano, citing jurisdictional issues and lack of conclusive evidence.

The case was taken to the Supreme Court, raising questions on the PCGG's jurisdiction and the admissibility of evidence obtained through the raid on Dimaano's residence.

Issues:

1. Whether the PCGG had the jurisdiction to investigate and cause the filing of a forfeiture petition against Ramas and Dimaano.
2. The propriety of the Sandiganbayan's dismissal of the case before the completion of the presentation of evidence by the petitioner.
3. Legality of the search and seizure conducted on Dimaano's residence.

Court's Decision:

1. The Supreme Court ruled that the PCGG did not have jurisdiction over Ramas as a "subordinate" of former President Marcos within the context of Executive Order Nos. 1, 2, 14, and 14-A. It concluded that the PCGG's mandate was specific to recovering ill-gotten

wealth of Marcos, his family, associates, and subordinates only if they amassed wealth by virtue of their close association with him, which was not established in the case against Ramas.

2. The Court dismissed the argument that the Sandiganbayan erred in dismissing the case prematurely, reasoning that the PCGG had ample time but failed to present substantial evidence. The lengthy delays and reliance on martial law-era sequestration powers without showing the sufficiency of evidence against Dimaano and Ramas led to the dismissal, which was deemed appropriate under the circumstances.

3. The Court found the search and seizure at Dimaano's residence, while backed by a warrant for illegal possession of firearms, exceeded its scope by confiscating items not listed in the warrant. Despite acknowledging the revolutionary government's broad powers during the interregnum, it declared the expanded scope of the seizure unjustifiable and ordered the return of seized items not specified in the warrant to Dimaano.

#### Doctrine:

The case reiterates the doctrine that the Presidential Commission on Good Government lacks jurisdiction over military personnel, such as Major General Ramas, without directly establishing their status as "subordinates" under the connotation of Executive Orders relevant to the commission's formation. Additionally, it upheld principles regarding the limits of search and seizure operations, emphasizing adherence to the scope specified by judicial warrants.

#### Class Notes:

1. Jurisdiction of the PCGG is limited and specific, focused on individuals clearly identified as having close ties to former President Marcos and his established network of ill-gotten wealth.
2. A specific warrant must list the items to be seized; property not listed but seized during a search is unlawfully obtained and must be returned if not inherently contraband.
3. The legal distinctions between the powers vested in bodies like the PCGG during transitional revolutionary governments and the protections offered to individuals under a fully established constitutional government.

#### Historical Background:

This case unfolded in the context of the Philippines' efforts to recover from the deep-seated corruption that characterized the Martial Law era under former President Ferdinand

Marcos. The establishment of the PCGG and its subsequent actions were part of the broader democratic restoration process following the 1986 EDSA People Power Revolution, which sought to address grievances from years of authoritarian rule and recover illicitly acquired wealth. The pivotal challenge in this and similar cases was balancing the pursuit of justice and accountability with adherence to legal standards, procedural rights, and evidentiary requirements within a recovering judicial system and the overarching need to restore democratic norms and the rule of law.