

### Title: People of the Philippines v. Alvin Pringas y Panganiban

### Facts:

The procedural odyssey of this case began with the charging of Alvin Panganiban Pringas (“appellant”) for violations of Sections 5, 11, and 12 of Republic Act No. 9165, the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002, in the Regional Trial Court (RTC) of Pasig City. On April 22, 2003, a buy-bust operation was conducted leading to Pringas’s arrest for selling 0.03 grams of methamphetamine hydrochloride (shabu) to an undercover police officer, as well as for the possession of additional quantities of the substance and drug paraphernalia in his residence. Despite filing a motion for reinvestigation citing lack of preliminary investigation, the RTC pursued the case, resulting in Pringas’s conviction.

This decision was appealed to the Court of Appeals, which affirmed the RTC’s ruling. Unsatisfied, Pringas elevated the case to the Supreme Court, challenging the legality of his arrest and the admissibility of the evidence obtained during the buy-bust operation, specifically arguing non-compliance with Sections 21 and 86 of Republic Act No. 9165.

### Issues:

1. Whether the buy-bust operation conducted without the direct involvement of the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) rendered the appellant’s arrest illegal.
2. Whether the failure of the apprehending officers to comply strictly with Section 21 of Republic Act No. 9165 regarding the custody and disposition of the confiscated/seized dangerous drugs and paraphernalia invalidated the evidence against the appellant.

### Court’s Decision:

1. **\*\*On the involvement of PDEA:\*\*** The Supreme Court dismissed Pringas’s claim, referencing its decision in *People v. Sta. Maria*, to uphold that other law enforcement agencies still retain authority to perform buy-bust operations provided that these cases will eventually be transferred to PDEA. The Court found that non-involvement of the PDEA does not make the arrest illegal nor does it render the evidence obtained inadmissible.
2. **\*\*On compliance with Section 21:\*\*** The Court held that while there was non-compliance with the procedural requirements under Section 21 of RA 9165, it was not sufficiently fatal to invalidate the arrest or the evidence gathered. Emphasizing the substance over form, the Court ruled that as long as the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items are preserved, the procedural lapses under Section 21 do not automatically merit the exclusion of the evidence obtained from the buy-bust operation.

Ultimately, the Supreme Court denied Pringas's appeal, affirming in toto the decision of the Court of Appeals which upheld the RTC's conviction of Pringas for violations of Sections 5, 11, and 12 of Republic Act No. 9165.

### ### Doctrine:

The Court reiterated the principle that non-compliance with Section 86 of Republic Act No. 9165, concerning the participation of the PDEA in drug-related arrests, does not invalidate arrests made by other law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, it underscored that non-compliance with Section 21's procedural requirements on the custody and disposition of seized drugs and paraphernalia is not fatal, provided the integrity and evidentiary value of the seized items are preserved.

### ### Class Notes:

- **Republic Act No. 9165 Sections 5, 11, and 12:** These sections pertain to the illegal sale, possession of dangerous drugs, and possession of equipment, instrument, apparatus, and other paraphernalia for dangerous drugs, respectively.
- **Essentials of a Buy-Bust Operation:** Proof of transaction and presentation in court of the corpus delicti.
- **Preservation of Integrity and Evidentiary Value:** Even if procedural lapses occur during the arrest or seizure of drugs, as long as the evidentiary value and integrity of the seized items are maintained, the operation's legality is upheld.
- **Role of PDEA:** While PDEA is the lead agency in the enforcement of laws against dangerous drugs, other law enforcement bodies retain their authority to perform operations related to the enforcement of such laws.

### ### Historical Background:

People of the Philippines v. Alvin Pringas y Panganiban is a landmark case that tested the procedural requirements set forth in the Comprehensive Dangerous Drugs Act of 2002 (Republic Act No. 9165) within the Philippine judicial system. Specifically, it delved into the roles and cooperation between different law enforcement agencies, notably the Philippine Drug Enforcement Agency (PDEA) and the Philippine National Police (PNP), in the battle against illegal drugs in the Philippines. The decision underscored the judiciary's stance on prioritizing the substantive over procedural law, especially in criminal cases involving illegal drugs, to convict offenders duly without being overly encumbered by technicalities.